TABLE OF CONTENTS.

NUMBER 1.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 1
The Importance of Elocution for Ministers of the Gospel. By Rev. Walter E. Tressel..... 13
A Sermon. By Rev. S. Schillinger..... 28
The Fundamental Principles of the Theory and Practice of Christian Missions. By Rev. J. E. Kieffer..... 38
The Pastor as a Student and Writer. By Rev. J. G. Troutman 52
The Leading Ideas of Judges. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 58
Notes. By G. H. S..... 61

NUMBER 2.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 65
The Doctrines of the Scriptures Concerning Original Sin. By Rev. A. F. Rohr, A. M..... 76
The Savior's Names as Recorded in Scriptures. By Rev. Julius Boehmer 100
The Christian in Temptation. By Rev. Fred W. Rohlfing.... 114
The Constant Need and the Wide Scope of the Church's Missionary Work. By Rev. M. H. Hockman..... 120
Notes. By G. H. S..... 125

NUMBER 3.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 129
The Science that Rules the Day. By Rev. C. B. Gohdes, A. M. 139
Studies in Vedic Religion. By Rev. Ernest Schultz..... 150
The Doctrines of the Scriptures Concerning Original Sin. By Rev. A. F. Rohr, A. M..... 160
Notes. By G. H. S..... 186

NUMBER 4.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 193
The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. By Rev. M. R. Walter..... 199
Sermon. By Rev. Walter L. Spielman, A. B..... 218

The Pastor's Pastor. By Prof. A. Pflueger, A. M..... 225
The Augsburg Confession. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 232
A Study of Luke 23, 34. By Rev. F. W. Almendinger..... 246
Notes. By G. H. S..... 253

NUMBER 5.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 257
The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. By Rev. M. R. Walter..... 264
The Finality of Conditions in the Future World. By Rev. F. W. Rohlfing 284
The Gods of the Vedas. By Rev. Ernest Schulz..... 293
A Sermon. By Rev. S. Schillinger, A. M..... 309
Notes. By G. H. S..... 319

NUMBER 6.

Universal and Personal Justification. By Rev. R. C. H. Lenski, A. M..... 321
Eph. 1:4, 5. By Rev. Reuben Schmitt, A. B..... 337
The Augsburg Confession. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 353
Notes. By G. H. S..... 379

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXV. FEBRUARY, 1905. No. 1.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

I. THE RADICALISM OF "MODERN THEOLOGY."

Nothing can be further from the truth than to imagine that the theology distinctively called "modern" and "advanced" is substantially only a further development of traditional Evangelical principles. The claim that it is such is constantly being made by the protagonists of the newer views and an effort to win friends for these innovaitons is often made on this ground. Indeed it is often maintained that the new theology can in reality historically make a better claim to recognition than the old, because it purposes to restore original teachings that have been perverted by the later theology that has been passing for orthodox. The "original Christianity of Christ" is a programme that Harnack and others of that ilk have written on their banners, and it has been the claim of the Ritschl school for decades, that with their emptying of the Evangelical teachings of their objective and real contents they are restoring the original and real Luther to the Church of the Reformation.

The fact of the matter is that so-called modern, or advanced, or critical theology is subversive of the very essentials and fundamentals of Evangelical faith. Evangelical Protestantism historically stands on two leading principles, the formal, which declares that the Scripture, as the inspired Word of God, is the final judge and court of appeals in all matters of faith; and the material principle, which declares that justification by faith alone without any merit on man's part is the foundation stone of Christian truth and doctrine.

Modern theology is diametrically antagonistic to both of these. This opposition is clearer in the case of the first mentioned principle than it is in reference to the latter. The subject of Higher Criticism, together with its leading teachings and tenets, has been popularized to a remarkable degree, and it is generally recognized that if the claims of this school are correct then the Scriptures have lost their preeminence and power as the decisive factor in matters of faith and life. Newer criticism makes merely a literature out of the sacred writings of the Old and New Testaments instead of a divinely revealed Word of God. It expressly denies all real inspiration to the sacred writers; teaches that at best and most the Bible only *contains* the Word of God but denies that it *is* His word; does not hesitate to declare that the human factor in the Scriptures has been so pronounced a force in the composition of these books that in many cases they misrepresent the actual historical development. It is declared ridiculous that this historical development is really a history of "redemption;" the "heilsgeschichtliche" character of the Scriptures is considered the outgrowth of dogmatical prejudices. The Bible at most is the historical record of a religious development in Israel, substantially naturalistic in character. Inspiration, inerrancy, unity, revealed truth are all substantially gone. It is accordingly not at all surprising that modern theology no longer will follow Luther and the sound precedent of best days of Evangelical theology in accepting the "Thus saith the Lord," and is busily engaged in hunting for a substitute upon which it can stand in the room of the "juridic" authority of the Scriptures. The facts here stated of modern Higher Criticism are public property and need no further proof, and the mere statement is satisfactory evidence that they are subversive of the formal principle of the Reformation. What is left of the Bible after the modern advanced critic gets through with it is scarcely worth preserving. Least of all can the Church make use of these leavings as the foundation of its creed and hope.

Less well known is the fact that modern theology is also subversive of the other cardinal principle of Evangelical theology, but this perversion has largely grown out of the former. Theology has in recent years been receiving the doubtful "blessing" of a "new method," generally known as the "religionsgeschichtliche." The method is briefly this, that practically all things in the Scriptures, both in the faith and the morals of the confessors of Christianity, as reported in the Scriptures, and which transcend the natural in thought and life, and hence mark the religion of the Bible as a revelation, are regarded as material borrowed from other and foreign religions and utilized by the Bible writers for their own purposes. The great Bibel-Babel controversy of Delitzsch is an interesting expression of this tendency, it being the chief purpose of his brochures to show that the worship of Jehovah by the Israelites was not the result of a special divine command but was borrowed from the Babylonians and hence was not a revelation of God. In his negative position Delitzsch agrees with others of this school, but not in stating the source of this worship. Stade, the radical Old Testament critic, declares that this worship was borrowed from Kenites who lived around Mt. Sinai at the time of the Exodus. Both are satisfied if only the one central idea is upheld, namely that this worship was *not* a special revelation of God to His people. The same method of interpretation or rather misinterpretation is applied to all of the providential facts of the Old Testament and to the mysteries of the New. The virgin birth of the Savior, the doctrine of the atonement, of the Trinity, of the Person of Christ, of the Lord's Supper, and indeed all transcendental features of our faith are interpreted as such appropriations and applications of the teachings and tenets of heathen religions. One of the most pronounced protagonists of this school is Professor Gunkel, of Berlin, has recently written a special work to show how readily all the mysteries of the New Testament yield to such an interpretation. With regard to the observance of the Sun-

day by the early Christians he declares that was an outgrowth of the teachings of the heathen religions, who were accustomed to consider certain days of the week as sacred to certain gods. The early Church called the Sunday "the Lord's Day," and after the manner of the Gentiles dedicated one day in the week to their God. The first day of the week was sacred to the Sun-god. That there must have been certain classes of the Jews who observed the first day of the week, and the early Christian Church must have received its recruits from this source, is a *deus ex machina* that Gunkel invents to explain his purely visionary theory for which he has not a single foundation in fact. Anything now-a-days is "scientific" theology if it is only rationalistic.

For many decades neological theology has been trying to get rid of that miracle of miracles, the resurrection of Jesus. As long as that stands, Christianity will stand, and the famous infidel was right, who declared that if he could overthrow this historical fact he would have easy work with the rest of the Christian system. Generally the so-called "visionary hypothesis" has been resorted to, according to which the vivid imagination of the disciples pursuaded them that they saw the Lord objectively and as a reality when in truth it was only a subjective vision. Gunkel thinks he has found a better way to explain this fact. He draws attention to the fact that throughout the Orient, among the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Phœnicians and others with whom the Israelites came into contact, the belief in the resurrection of the gods was universal. This belief is originally the explanation of a phenomenon of nature. The divinities of the Sun and the vegetation die in the winter and come to life again in the spring. The form in which the resurrection of Jesus is described in the New Testament is the same as that found in other religions, although the contents differ. How easy it was for the early Christians to appropriate and adopt this common belief to their own peculiar needs, is the hypothesis of Gunkel, causing the average thoughtful reader to be filled with amaze-

ment at the minimum of fact that he needs to make up a maximum of hypothesis. Theologians who can engage in such business are certainly afflicted with a type of madness. The idea that a fact that revolutionized religious thought should have been merely an adaptation of a heathen notion is preposterous beyond description and shows how unutterably foolish men can become when they think themselves above the Word.

It is this same type of thought that is trying to restore "original Christianity" at the cost of real Christianity. Not Christ but the Apostle Paul is regarded as the real author of the Christian system of doctrine, it being maintained that the whole superstructure of the person and work of Christ, especially the atonement on the basis of the death of Christ, which is the kernel and heart of orthodox faith, was not a part and portion of the original proclamation of Christ, but was a theory of Christianity that Paul invented and grafted upon the new faith. The Christ of the Synoptic gospels — for the fourth gospel and its Christology are regarded as historically unauthentic and as a "theology" is not an objective truth — is practically only a great moral teacher, whose chief mission it was to declare to man that God is the Father of all and deeply loves all and that true Christianity consists simply in having again learned this great fact, which has been obscured by the Pauline doctrine of the "wrath of God" and of the direful consequences of sin. In the famous lectures of Harnack on the Essence of Christianity, no statement proved more offensive than the words that in the original preaching of Jesus there was room only for God the Father, so that Christ himself did not constitute a part of this real gospel. The statement means just what it says, and except in so far as Jesus revealed to men the true loving character of the Father He has really nothing to do with the religious creed and hopes of man.

Paul accordingly is virtually regarded as the corrupter of the Christian religion, although Harnack himself does not like this expression, preferring merely to say that the

Pauline type of theological development is not necessarily the true one. But other more open defenders of this view, are not slow to say what they think of Paul. Dr. Wernle, of the University of Basel, says:

"It is to be deeply regretted that the whole life of Jesus, especially His Word, was sacrificed by the later theology of Paul, to the resurrection and to the death of Jesus. These latter ideas have no place in the original proclamation of the gospel. Jesus and Paul are widely apart on many points. Jesus teaches the individual joy, courage, strength; Paul insists that there can be no help except through the Church. In reality Paul did not know the Jesus of the Gospels; he knows only the crucified and the risen Son of God, and the latter is the Redeemer of the preaching of Paul. The latter way of figuring out the merits of Christ's death is really a type of rationalistic thought. The results of the innovations of Paul were momentous for the Church. It was in this way that Christianity conquered the world; it was not the simple Word of Jesus of Nazareth that did it."

Christ's work accordingly was not to live and to die for mankind. Harnack says it was "solely and alone to announce the free grace of God." Professor Schürer says on this subject:

"God is a loving Father for all men, indeed for all creatures, who in love has compassion on all and cares for all, great and small. Man has nothing to do but to go to Him in childlike confidence and submit to Him in humility. Every one who would come is welcome, the sinner included."

This is the new "ideal" that Jesus came to teach and to illustrate by His exemplary life. Sin, punishment, condemnation, etc., have no place in such a system. It is simply the "Fatherhood of God" in the widest naturalistic sense. On this ground one can understand why Ritschl calls sin only "ignorance." It means only that man is ignorant of the fact that God is not angry at him on account of his sins, but that He loves Him and all creatures. As soon as

he ceases to be ignorant of this fact, he becomes a loved and a loving child of the Father. The whole doctrine of redemption through the blood of Christ, the whole material principle of the Reformation has no part or share in this new theology. It is altogether "new"; indeed it is so "new" that there is no theology left. Its *proton pseudos* naturally lies where the source of nearly all rationalistic theology is to be found, namely in the doctrine of sin, or rather in the absence of such a doctrine. Where this dogma is weakened the whole superstructure of theology falls to the ground. And yet the new school claims that they represent the real Luther! They do use the theological terminology of the Lutheran Church, but by a dishonesty beyond a parallel put into this terminology meanings altogether different from their real contents. Jesus is still the "Savior," but he only saves us from the results of our own ignorance as to the love of the Father; theology is "to return to Christ," which means that the historic Christ as a moral and model man is to be regarded as the substance of the Gospel. The new school still speaks of the "wrath of God," but means by it only the wrath that at the end of time will await those who will not accept the love of God. It is a theology of Lutheran words but with no Lutheran substance. An excellent series of little volumes on this phase of the problem is that of Professor Walther, of Rostock, entitled *"Das Erbe der Reformation im Kampfe der Gegenwart,"* of which two have appeared, one *"Der Glaube an das Wort Gottes,"* and a second *"Rechtfertigung oder religioeses Erlebniss."*

We have here given only a few facts in the case without much comment, believing that the facts tell their own story, and that story is the deplorable truth, that modern advanced theology, calling itself Protestant and Evangelical, is overthrowing the fundamental principles of Evangelical Protestantism. It is a worse type of thought than was the vulgar rationalism of a hundred years ago. It is the rankest unbelief sailing under dishonest colors, and between it and true theology there is no common ground and there can be no compromise.

II. THE PROTESTANT CHURCH FEDERATION PROBLEM IN GERMANY.

They are trying to make Church history in the land of Luther, the project being to effect a federation of the state churches in the Empire. As matters now stand, Germany is united politically and for military purposes, but not in matters of education or of Church. In fact while there are twenty-five political states united in the Empire there are no fewer than forty-eight different Protestant state churches. This surplus of churches over the states is owing to the fact that when certain of the larger states absorbed the smaller, the independent church organizations of the latter remained. Thus Prussia in 1866 annexed three provinces, each of which retained its own state church. In this way the nine old provinces of Prussia have the "United Church," organized by the combination of the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches in 1817, but in Hanover and in Schleswig-Holstein the state churches are Lutheran. This union of state and Church is one of the inheritances of the Reformation, when, humanly speaking, Luther and his coadjutors would not have been able to accomplish their great work without the aid of the powerful state. But the state has long since ceased to be the protector of the Church in Germany and has become an unjust master. In this way it forces upon the younger generation of pastors and preachers a lot of radical and even rationalistic theological professors in the Universities and the Church has neither voice nor vote in deciding who shall hold these responsible positions so essential to the welfare of the Church. Rather singularly those who complain most of this unjust control of the state do not seem to dream of a separation of state and Church. Seemingly all classes of Protestants in that Empire are a unit in adhering to the *status quo* in this regard. A break of the historic tie between state and Church that has existed for four centuries is not in sight. No signs point to the consummation of such a project. "Free Church" movements number their friends few and far between.

For several years a project of effecting a federation of these state churches has been engaging the attention of all the branches of Protestant Germany. It is not altogther a new project and visions of such a union of forces were entertained at different times by churchmen and statesmen. In its present phase the movement is the product of the fertile brain of the Emperor, who in an address delivered at Gotha urged upon the churches to come to some kind of an understanding. He asked particularly the Eisenach Conference to take this matter in hand, as that influential though unofficial association of representatives of the different state churches, had in the past accomplished some excellent joint results of the German churches, such as the Halle revision of Luther's translation of the Bible. The Conference accordingly took the matter in hand, appointed its committees, entered into negotiations with the various state churches, and with the consent of the majority organized a *"Kirchenausschuss"* with headquarters in Dresden. The scheme is not to unite the churches at all, least of all on the basis upon which all true Church union should be effected, namely in harmony in all the essentials in faith and practice, but only a federation of state churches, more in appearance than in substance, and without in any way touching the doctrinal standing of the individual churches. Just in what respect the new joint commission is to represent the church does not yet appear, but at most it will be in purely external matters and have at best an advisory power. The very first manifesto of the commission, whihc was officially organized on the Reformation Day of 1903, proved rather a dismal failure. Its first utterance was against the aggressiveness of the Ultramontane Roman Catholic propaganda in the Fatherland, and a protest addressed to the government against the undue favoritism shown to the Roman Catholic party in the state and the parliament. Within a few days after this first public utterance the German government consented to the abrogation of the first paragraph of the anti-Jesuit law and thereby showed that the *Kirchenausschuss* was not yet the power behind the throne.

The whole project finds but little favor in the Lutheran circles, as is quite natural should be the case. Lutherans believe in Church union but only on Scriptural grounds. Then too the reasonable fear is entertained that this external federation will be used as a means to force a unionistic church sooner or later after the model of the Prussian union upon the Empire. Only a minority of the Great Lutheran Congress recently held in Rostock decided to protest against any further extension of this federation, but it is very evident that none of the Lutherans have any confidence in the future of the project. One of its good results is evidently to force the Lutherans into a closer compact for the purpose of preserving the confessional principles and rights.

Other sections of the Church are discontented that the movement is not advancing more rapidly. Two largely attended conventions of such men were held recently, one in Worms and one in Leipzig, the latter of which turned its darts also against the Roman Catholic Church and its present policy in the Fatherland. Both conventions were tentative and educational, purposing rather to agitate than to accomplish certain definite ends. If there is anything that will force the Protestants into a closer union it will be the necessity of self-preservation caused by the impudent insults of the Roman Catholics. Although these constitute only one-third of the population of Germany they form the most powerful faction in the Parliament and attack Protestantism in a most insulting manner. Characteristic of their method is the new Life of Luther, written by the Jesuit Denifle, in which, by a singular perversion of statements taken from Luther's own writings, he is made out to be a profligate and wicked man. The best Protestant historians have published replies to this abuse of historical sources, but the Romanists believe they have again "crushed" the Reformer. It is singular how such attacks upon Luther succeed each other, run their course, have their day, and then die out. Some fifteen years ago Janssen "proved" from historic sources that the Reformation was "the greatest misfortune that ever befell the civilized world." His vol-

times were the sensation of the times and called forth many answers. Later it became the craze to "prove" that Luther had committed suicide. This too has run its course and is now relieved by the efforts of Denifle. Such attempts, however, on the part of the Romanists are really playing with fire, as they arouse the "furor Evangelicus" and in the end react on the Church of error itself.

Unfortunately, however, the influence on the Protestants is not such as it should be. Instead of driving them back to a recognition of the Biblical and Evangelical principles of the Reformation, in which the strength of Protestantism really lies and with which it will stand and fall,, the Protestants of Germany resort rather to external devices and schemes to gain strength, such as organizations of associations and the like. In this way the Protestant "Bund" has been established on the purely negative basis of "fighting Rome with pen and tongue," and this has a membership of one hundred thousand and more, mostly from the educated and influential circles of the land. Union will accomplish much, but in the Kingdom of God truth only accomplishes tangible and permanent results. The absence of this element as the chief factor in the federation of the churches makes the real benefit and blessing of such a co-operation a matter of more than serious doubt. What the Protestant Church of Germany needs more than anything else is a thorough revival and rejuvenation of the Biblical theology of Luther and the Reformation.

III. THEOLOGY AND RELIGION.

It is popular at present to draw a distinction between theology and religion, to the credit of the latter and to the discredit of the former. The statement is often made that a man's religion is better than his theology. The scheme of an "undogmatical Christianity"— whatever that in reality may mean — is often proposed. The trend is against dogma and doctrine, and, ostensibly, in favor of religion. In truth however, a man's religion is never better than his theology; but it can be worse. Theology is the ideal that

religion tries to realize, and the actual is never up to the ideal but may be and generally is deeply inferior to it. It is true that this theology need not be in a formulated shape, but it must include the principles, which ever more or less unconsciously constitutes the rule and regulation of our life and conduct. Dogmas and doctrines are the expression of certain things and great facts, and these things and facts, whether formally expressed or not, constitute the theology of a person. A simple-minded Christian is fully convinced of the merits of the atoning death of Christ, but may not be able to formulate the doctrine. But the fact of the atonement is the basis of his religious creed, faith and trust, and because it is his theological principle that Christ's death is an actual atonement, his religious convictions, as these control his life, are based on these facts. Just to a degree in which a Christian believes that the things or facts expressed in dogmas and doctrines are really objective realities, will his religious life be influenced by his belief. A modern Christian, who sees in Jesus of Nazareth only a great teacher and a model of morality, but not the eternal Son of God, who shed His blood for man's sin, will trust to Jesus nothing else than to find in Him a guide or an incentive to model moral life. His religion cannot possibly go further than his theology. On the other hand, he who sees in Christ his Savior will trust Him as such and expects to get from Him eternal salvation. The modern Christian must eliminate out of his religion all those things that the orthodox believer trusts that Christ can do for him because He is the Son of the living God. It is in theology as it is in any department of life that is other than abstract thought. The creed will always make the man. A man will determine his political activity and connection entirely by his political creed. Unless he believes in democratic principles he will not work for a republican form of government. Just in proportion as theology is eliminated from the make-up of a man, just in the same degree religion is also eliminated. If he has no Christian principles—and

these are theology, whether formulated or not—he has no Christian religion. If not naturalistic grounds he discards the supernatural factors in Christianity, his religion too will of a necessity be purely naturalistic. A man's religion can never rise above his theology, as little as an effect can rise above the cause. The proposed separation of the two is an impossibility and only a pretext to retain the blessings of Christianity without retaining the objective foundation of these blessings. The whole is a rationalistic scheme, and the Lutheran contention, for the purity of the faith and for the purity of the doctrine, has it anything but an academic interest. It involves the life and soul of religion itself.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ELOCUTION FOR MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL.*

BY REV. WALTER E. TRESSEL, FREMONT, O.

Many, manifold and weighty are the duties of the Christian ministry. God has abated none of the requirements which He originally made of those who enter upon the work of this office; and these requirements are no small thing. And the demands made by the Church and by the public have not decreased, but have increased. St. Paul has well expressed the thought which, under these conditions, comes to many minds: "Who is sufficient for these things?" (2 Cor. 2, 16), and has made a confession in which he does not stand alone: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, . . . but our sufficiency is of God." (2 Cor. 3, 5.)

It is reassuring to the gospel minister to hear these comforting words: "All things are yours. . . . And ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." (1 Cor. 3, 21-23.) If the demands made in these modern times upon the minister are large he knows that the resources upon which he

*Read at the meeting of the First English District, and published by request of that body.

is privileged to draw are larger still, are inexhaustible. He knows, too, that all the realms of nature, history, human experience, science and art are his; that he may lay them all under tribute, and may sanctify their treasures by the Word of God and prayer to the service of his high calling.

In the use of the stores furnished by the various domains of knowledge and art a right judgment must be exercised. The various sciences and arts are not all equally important. The time and the attention bestowed on them will be commensurate with their relative importance. "The one thing needful" will suffer no displacement at the hands of another fact or truth. The crown must not be removed from the head of Christ and placed upon the brow of Plato or Cicero.

Among the subjects assigned for discussion at this Synodical convention is one which, though not pretending to rank in importance with many of the matters which usually engage the attention of a body of men like the one here assembled, yet puts forward a modest request for recognition and consideration. If the author of this essay places strong emphasis on the subject which he has been chosen to set forth and champion, let it be remembered that he has no intention of belittling other sciences and other arts. Such an impression can easily be conveyed when a writer or a speaker advocates the claims of some particular subject.

To the writer's knowledge this is the first time in the history of our District, perhaps in the history of our Synod, that the importance of elocution has received definite and independent consideration. This subject was proposed at the meeting held in Fremont, and was doubtless suggested by the helpful series of lectures and exercises held some time previous under the auspices of the Rye Beach Summer School. One of the members of that class has since declared that he could not tell how much of blessing he owed to the lessons learned at Rye Beach. He acknowledged that perhaps even his life had been saved by the information gained and the exercises practiced.

has, therefore, received attention from some of our men, and it is hoped that the present discussion will secure favorable consideration in wider circles for the merits of Elocution.

Before assigning reasons for the importance attached to a study of Elocution for clergymen it will be proper to inquire, *What is Elocution?* Let us ask those who are in a position to speak with authority.

Wm. T. Ross, A .M., author of "Voice Culture and Elocution," says: "Elocution is the art of expressing thought and feeling by means of voice and action." Mr. Ross declares: "Elocution does not consist in mere imitation of the voice and manner of the teacher, nor in the learning to recite pieces as a parrot learns to talk." The same writer says that it is not the purpose of Elocution to destroy, but to preserve "the *individuality* of the student." "The *true* province of Elocution, therefore, is not to make a person *less,* but *more,* natural." S. S. Hamill, A. M., at one time Professor of Rhetoric, English Literature and Elocution in Illinois Wesleyan University, in his work entitled "Science of Elocution," expresses himself in almost the exact language employed by Mr. Ross: "Elocution is the expression of thought and feeling by voice and action." Then he gives a more comprehsnive view: "Elocution is both a science and an art. As a science it investigates, classifies, and applies the elements and principles of expression; as an art it gives a practical illustration to these elements and principles." "The Art of Elocution cultivates the voice, perfects the articulation, improves the respiration, gives ease and grace to position and movement — propriety and power to gesture and attitude." Albert M. Bacon, A. M., Professor of Elocution, in his "Manual of Gesture," writes as follows: "Rhetorical delivery includes the management of the voice, the gesture, the attitude and the expression of the countenance." The Century Dictionary fur-

nishes this definition of Elocution: "The manner of speaking in public; the art of correct delivery in speaking or reading; the art which teaches the proper use of the voice, gesture, etc., in public speaking." Other authorities express themselves to the same effect.

From the foregoing it appears that Elocution is regarded both as a science and also as an art; that it teaches how to breathe, trains the voice, disciplines the hand, the foot, in fact the whole body, and fits the speaker for the task of imparting effectively his thoughts. As Logic trains and develops a man's thinking powers, so Elocution trains and develops a man's speaking powers.

This training is not intended for actors, declaimers and reciters only, but also for lawyers, lecturers and clergymen. The false idea seems to prevail in some quarters that Elocution is a training designed exclusively for the stage; that the form of expression which it cultivates is solely the dramatic. Such a notion is disclaimed by all who profess to speak with knowledge and authority.

With this uderstanding of what is meant by Elocution let us address ourselves to the subject assigned for this paper.

1. *Elocution is important for ministers of the gospel because it trains and equips them for a large and important part of their work.*

The minister of the gospel is a thinker, a student, a writer. The functions discharged by him in these several capacities are of great importance. But the minister has, also, other work. He is called upon, in the exercise of his office, to give utterance to his thoughts, to put forth by means of the spoken word the results of his studies. In his pastoral ministrations the minister has frequent occasion to speak to his parishioners. In their sorrows and distresses they appeal to him for counsel and comfort. He calls on them in their homes, where he instructs, or admonishes, or warns, or consoles, as the situation may demand. In the sick-chamber, in the death-chamber, he must lift up his voice, sometimes in the tender and devotional language of

prayer, again in the declaration of eternal truth, especially in the proclamation of the consolations which the gospel offers. How important it is that on such occasions he know how to employ that wonderful instrument, the voice, for the transmission of his thoughts, yea, of God's thoughts.

The minister of the gospel is a public speaker and reader. He appears in this capacity at council and congregational meetings, at teachers' meetings, at young people's meetings, in the catechetical class, in the Sunday-school. He must baptize, must solemnize marriages, must bury the dead. He must speak, at times, under the most trying conditions; in overheated, ill-ventilated rooms, whose atmosphere is, perhaps, tainted with the germs of disease; or out in the cold, bleak cemetery; in audience rooms whose acoustic properties are excellent, in others where the acoustics are execrable.

In the public services the greatest demands are made upon the minster's voice. He serves as liturgist and lector and preacher. For at least three-fourths of the time occupied by the service the minister uses his voice. How important that he have sound and healthy vocal organs, and a voice which can endure the severe strain to which it is subjected. How desirable that he be able to speak, under all these trying conditions, in a voice clear, expressive and pleasing!

Elocution will train and equip the minister of the gospel for this great and important part of his work. It will teach the right way to breathe, and how, in speech, to use and economize breath. It will strengthen the weak voice. It will cure nasality, so repulsive and disgusting; will remove aspiration, the expenditure of unvocalized breath; it will call attention to the other defects in the voice and its use, and a proper application of its principles will generally remedy these defects. Then the speaker's attention will be directed to his countenance, and he will be helped in laying aside grimaces and distortions of the face which are displeasing and hurtful to delivery; awkwardness of attitude,

impropriety of gesture, etc., are disclosed and removed, grace and ease and expressiveness taking their place.

The trend of all this discipline is not to make a man artificial, imitative or theatrical. Most men have, by nature or by acquirement, serious defects which need to be got rid of. Do we not say to unregenerate men, "Ye must be born again?" And if a man, by nature or otherwise, suffer from some weakness or defect in his vocal organs, ought not he to be born again? Curran, the noted Irish orator, "declared that his shrill and fractious voice was in 'a state of nature,' and he was quite right in resolving to bring it out of a state of nature into a state of efficiency."* The feeling which exists in some quarters is illustrated by the following incident: "The friends of a young man destined to professional life as a public speaker were solicitous about his success in speaking, and suggested the importance of his devoting himself to the study and practice of Elocution. 'I want no artificial training,' was the prompt reply; 'find me the thing to say, and I'll find the manner of saying it.' "†

There is truth in the old saying that the orator is born, not made; but Cicero rightly observed, "To be an orator something more is necessary than *to be born.*"

2. *Elocution is important for ministers of the gospel because it prepares them for a suitable and worthy presentation of the grandest truths which tongue can speak.*

The minister is an "ambassador for Christ," and he preaches, "Be ye reconciled to God." He is a prophet, a spokesman for God. He has received the commission, "Speak to this people;" "Cry aloud, and spare not;" "Preach the Word."

For one who is entrusted with so notable an ambassadorship as that conferred by Jesus Christ it is, without question, of first importance that his heart be right. "Here am I, Lord, send me," is the prophet's expression of the spirit which should characterize the servant of God who would minister in holy things and in holy places. But it is

*Sheppard, Before An Audience, p. 23.

†Bardeen, Rhetoric, p. 562.

also important that such a servant give fitting and appropriate setting to the noble truth with which he is charged. His organs of speech and his whole body, not only the soul, are to be electrified by the gospel. Having believed, he ought to speak; but he should speak so as to exhibit properly and convincingly his belief.

"Now thank we all our God,
With hearts and hands and voices."

Not only with "hearts," but also with "hands and voices."

Is it right and fitting that a man, called to preach the word, deliver his message in so weak a voice that those farthest removed from him cannot hear what he says? Is it right and fitting that a man, commissioned to proclaim truths which concern the soul's eternal welfare, so mumble his words that comparatively few hear those truths? Is it right and fitting that the sweet and comforting Gospel promises be made known in a harsh, displeasing, snarling tone of voice? Did the Lord, our God, ever command, or even suggest, that the clergyman speak the word as unacceptably and disagreeably as possible? The precious word of God from heaven deserves to be set forth in a suitable and worthy form, deserves to be given adequate expression.

A right use and application of the principles of elocution will help a man to present worthily the grand truths of salvation.

Addison, the great English esayist, said: "Our preachers stand stock still in the pulpit, and will not so much as move a finger to set off the best sermons in the world. . . . We talk of life and death in cold blood, and keep our temper in a discourse which turns upon everything that is dear to us."

Further, the service should, in the proper sense, be a work of art from beginnig to end. Then the minister should be an artist. Zion is the "perfection of beauty" (Ps. 50, 2). We speak of the "beauty of holiness." "God in His holy

temple." Everything said and done in sacred places and at sacred seasons should be in conformity with the occasion. How easily the whole service can be spoiled by the minister, whether as liturgist or preacher! Words mispronounced, emphasis misplaced, monotones, unsuitable tones, are not a rendering, but a rending, of the service. "Nowhere," says one writer,* "are words carelessly thrown together and flippantly uttered so apt to prove fatal, and are forms incongruously joined and indifferently gone through with so offensive, as they are in the public services of the church." "As they are called to participate in them, so may men and must they be fitted and employed to lead in the services; but this is an office both arduous and honorable enough to tax and to grace the highest and purest human efforts."

"The Persian poet Sadi tells us that a person with a disagreeable voice was reading the Koran aloud, when a holy man, passing by, asked what was his monthly stipend. He answered, 'Nothing at all.' 'But why then do you take so much trouble?' He replied, 'I read for the sake of God.' The other rejoined, 'For God's sake, do not read; for if you read the Koran in this manner you will destroy the splendor of Isdamism.'"

3. *Elocution for ministers of the gospel in this day is important in order that the duties which they owe to the present age may be rendered more acceptably.*

Our age is one of education and culture. The education may not always be the sort which commends itself to the devout Christian, the culture may often be a superficial or pseudo-refinement; but the fact remains that the people of this day are enjoying far greater educational advantages than were afforded their forefathers. They are more ready, and in some respects more competent, to pass judgment and to criticize. Modern education generally includes some elocutionary training—often crude and insufficient, 'tis true—and those so trained are more likely than not to express their judgment freely, not even sparing the minister of the gospel. Without catering to a depraved taste, or seeking to

*Dr. C. H. L. Schuette, Before The Altar, p. 3.

win the favor and applause of incompetent and self-constituted judges, the clergyman should nevertheless seek, by every proper and reasonable effort, to do his work so as to evoke or occasion the least possible adverse criticism. It is the part of wisdom to do this. He who ministers in holy things, and who in former times was looked up to both as intellectual and also as spiritual leader in the community, certainly should not covet the unenviable distinction of being considered a "back-number," or as having lost his grasp and grip on things that make for true growth and progress. The minister who declares himself indifferent to all criticism, who chooses to disregard or insult the best intelligence of the community, is false to his trust. For there is a right culture and a praiseworthy intelligence. Is it possible that right here, in the spirit of disregard of the times and contempt, real or affected, for contemporaneous thought and custom, in the slights and insults offered intelligent communities even in the external presentation of God's truth, we shall find one reason—though not the only reason—why churches here and there are "found too feeble to carry the truth of God beyond" their "own walls"?*

How often and how severely the clergy are criticised on account of their poor delivery! Their faulty pronunciation, their imperfect enunciation, their awkward and meaningless gestures, their split or nasal voices—these things do not pass unnoticed. The criticism is frequently heard: "What a powerful preacher that man would be if he could speak as well as he thinks!" John Byrom, the poet, spoke quite disparagingly of the ecclesiastical speakers of his day, and his lines are not wholly unsuitable at the present time:

"In point of sermons, 'tis confest
Our English clergy make the best;
But this appears, we must confess,
Not from the pulpit, but the press.
They manage, with disjointed skill,
The matter well, the manner ill;
And, what seems paradox at first,
They make the best, and preach the worst."

*V. Joint Synod Minutes, 1904, p. 14 (President's Address).

The present age has been called an oratorical age.* There was a time when the pulpit had few, if any, rivals. Now, not only do the daily and weekly papers, the periodicals and magazines, the secular and the religious press, the thousands of books annually published, threaten the popularity and influence of the pulpit; but the orators of platform and lyceum, the orators of the political arena and of congressional and legislative halls, the orators of the legal tribunals, are each day winning away from the orators of the pulpit the honors which once belonged to those who discoursed upon sacred themes. Under these circumstances it is surely the part of wisdom for those who preach the gospel to call to their aid every right means for maintaining the influence of the pulpit. Elocution will be discovered to be one of the important helps which the minister should place under tribute for maintaining and increasing his power.

4. *The attention which Jesus gave to His manner of speaking should incite the minister of the gospel to devote time and study to elocution.*

John 7, 37, we read: "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.'" The verb ἔκραζεν is used here. It means, He cried out, cried aloud, "uttered or taught something publicly and solemnly." Jesus' voice was in perfect accord with the solemnity of this "especially high day." Schuster says, "Where the circumstances and the nature of the address demanded it, the Lord did not deem it out of place to use the full power of His voice." In John 12, 44, the same verb occurs again (in a different tense): "Jesus cried out and said." Charged with a great message, addressing many of His audience for the last time, some of whom, notwithstanding the "many miracles," did not believe, others of whom, though they believed, fearing to confess Him, Jesus lifted up His voice, lending to it an

*Cf. C. F. Th. Schuster, Dr. th., Generalsuperintendent und Konsistorialrat in Hanover, "Der Gute Vortrag, line Kunst und line Tugend," p .10.

earnestness and solemnity intended to impress those whose souls' salvation was at stake. In John 11, 43, we encounter a word closely related to the former, namely ἐκραύγασεν. The evangelist is here at some pains to describe accurately the Savior's manner of speaking. Not only does he declare, "He cried out," but he adds, "with a loud voice." It was when he raised Lazarus from the dead that Jesus thus "cried with a loud voice." It was an unusually solemn occasion. The Prince of Life was opposed to the power of death, and, recognizing the full importance of that hour, Jesus spoke with unusual power. Lange's Commentary (ad locum) mentions "the loud call with a powerful voice and majestic utterance." From John 20, 16, we learn another quality of Jesus' voice. Into the one word "Mary" He poured a world of tenderness; His loving heart lay in that word.

We can form some conception of the power of Jesus' vince (as well as of the truth which He proclaimed) from the effect of His address. In Luke 4, 22, it is related, "All bare Him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth." Luke 5, 2, tells us, "The people pressed upon Him to hear the Word of God." In Matt. 7, 29, witness is borne to the dignity and force of His words, "He taught them as one having authority." John 7, 46, gives the testimony of the officers sent to take Jesus and who returned without having accomplished the appointed task. Their excuse was, "Never man spake like this man." A triumph of sacred oratory!

Jesus did not despise the service of the eye and of the hand in order to make emphatic the message of His voice. St. Mark (10, 21), informs us that Jesus, beholding a certain youth, "loved him." The Savior's eye was expressive of that love. In Mark 3, 5, it is stated of Him that He "looked round about on them with anger." And who can forget how the "Lord turned and looked upon Peter" (Luke 22, 61)? The Savior employed gestures to emphasize His words. Matt. 12, 48: "And He stretched forth His hand toward His disciples and said, Behold my mother and my

brethren!" Luke 24, 50, on the occasion of the ascension, "He lifted up His hands and blessed them." (Cf. Acts 13, 16; 21, 40; 12, 17.)

5. *The achievement in sacred oratory of the great preachers of former centuries should spur the present day ministry to give attention to the matter of delivery.*

It is necessary to cite but a few examples to illustrate and enforce this proposition. We call attention to Gregory Nazianzen, to Ephraem the Syrian. Of Chrysostom, probably the greatest orator of the Greek church, it has been said: "He had trained his natural gift of eloquence, which was of the first order, in the school of Demosthenes and Libanius, and ennobled and sanctified it in the highest school of the Holy Spirit." (Schaff III, 938.) "When Chrysostom rose and preached in the terrible insurrection in Antioch, his twenty-one famous homilies on punishment, repentance and consolation rolled like heavy peals of thunder with falling lightning, flash on flash, over the thousands fiercely thronging around his pulpit; or sometimes like the refreshing morning dew, trickling down into the hearts of the alarmed and contrite multitude." (Schmauk, The Voice, p. 161.) Concerning Luther we read (Schaff, Church History, VI, p. 491): "He was a Boanerges, the like of whom Germany never heard before or since. He had all the elements of a popular orator. Melanchthon said: 'One is an interpreter, one a logician, another an orator, but Luther is all in all.' Bossuet gives him credit for 'a lively and impetuous eloquence by which he delighted and captivated his hearers.'" Nebe (Geschichte der Predigt, II, p. 85), after describing Luther's wonderful natural gifts as an orator, goes on to say: "These great natural gifts do not break forth in their rough and native form, in uncouth naturalness. These eminent gifts were schooled and disciplined. Let no man overlook the fact of Luther's culture."

Our church is heir to many noble oratorical traditions. May her sons thankfully receive these treasures, and, so far as lies in their power, contribute to their enlargement and unimpaired delivery to future generations.

6. *What men distinguished in the Church have to say concerning the study of oratory is worthy of consideration.*

Not all have shared the opinion expressed by the philosophers of the middle ages (Schröckh's Church History, Vol. 34, p. 220) that "their freedom of expression dare not be limited by the precepts of the ancients," and who called eloquence an "unnecessary piece of veneering." The thought was current that philosophy should be presented even in a rough, repulsive form, so that not everybody might be admitted to the sacred precincts of philosophy and its treasures become too common. Some theologians regarded the study of eloquence with suspicion because it had descended from the ancient poets and orators, was boastful and vainglorious, and because many holy and reverend men had expressed themselves well, although they had not studied oratory. Paulus Cortesius (died 1510), called the Cicero (or the Lactantius) among the dogmaticians of his time, defended rhetoric and eloquence, and asked the philosophers why, since they honored their Aristotle more devoutly than the Egyptians honored Ibis, they were so disinclined to the use of a well-developed form of expression such as their master employed.

Dr. Luther exhibited his interest in the subject of good delivery by giving advice regarding it.* In naming the qualifications of 'a good preacher he mentioned, among other things, fluency of speech and a good voice.

John Gerhard, the prince of dogmaticians (Locus XXIV, Caput III, Sect. XIII; Vol. II, p. 171, Cotta ed.) commends eloquence, and insists that the minister should be able to set forth his thoughts logically, clearly and fluently. The minister must be endowed with the gift of instructing others. Buddeus (Moral. Theol., p. 758) speaks of the natural talent and genius for speaking which a man may possess, but advises that the natural gift be improved by practice. He urges that the principles handed down by men experienced in oratory receive attention, so that "nature can be improved and perfected." Elsewhere (p. 784)

*V. Nebe, Geschichte der Predigt, II, p. 31f.

he speaks of "directing nature." Deyling (De Prudentia Pastorali, p. 325) gives advice regarding the control of the voice. He suggests that, if there be any fault in the voice, it be corrected by proper care and by art. Palmer (Homiletik, p. 522) admits, with regard to the voice, that not every preacher is equipped as he ought to be, but expresses the conviction that, by diligent practice, the voice can be made to do its work satisfactorily. He quotes Stier, who says: "Ein Prophetenzögling darf und soll auch den Mund und dessen Ton, als Werkzeug seines heiligen Amtes, üben und bilden für das Zeugnis Gottes, wie ein Demosthenes es für seine Redezwecke that." Cf. also what Dr. G. V. Zezschwitz (in Zöckler's Handbuch der Theologischen Wissenschaften, Vol. IV, p. 228) says regarding oratorical culture.

7. *The fact that progressive colleges and schools of divinity give elocution a place in their curiculum confirms the position taken in this paper.*

At Cornell, for example, instruction is given "in breathing, management of the voice, gesture, and general delivery." Princeton, Yale, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, make similar provision for their students. At Yale Divinity School a "thorough course in vocal and elocutionary training," and extending over a period of three years, is given. Chicago Theological Seminary, the Reformed Seminary at Lancaster, Pa. (Franklin and Marshall), Auburn Theol. Seminary (Presbyterian), Rochester Theol. Seminary (Baptist), Andover Theol. Seminary and a host of others could be named whose faculties have a professor of elocution and oratory. Among Lutheran schools, Capital University, Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Wittenberg, Augustana College, have introduced the study of elocution. Investigation would doubtless disclose the fact that nearly every college and every theological school in the country have arranged to furnish their students a training in the art of speaking.

All of which is significant.

Before bringing this paper to a close it may prove of some help to read the somewhat sharp and caustic, but, on the whole, justifiable, criticism offered by Nathan Sheppard, lecturer and writer, in his book, "Before an Audience" (p. 24f.): "The student in public speaking cannot begin too soon after his voice is what is called 'formed' to look after it with his will, and keep an anxious and alert ear upon it. Like every other habit, that of indistinctness or slovenliness of delivery will grow with the growth and strengthen with the strength. A case in point occurs to me. It will serve as an illustration and an admonition. It is that of a preacher who had this habit of indistinctness while a student, but would give no heed to criticism. He considered such matters beneath one so much 'in earnest' and so pious. He resented all interference by the critics of the debating society in college, and we need not be surprised to learn that he is now morbidly sensitive to the criticisms of his articulation, or, rather, his want of it. Now, this wretched mortal comes up to the severest requirements of the ordaining clergy. He is 'in earnest.' He is pious. He prays. He preaches 'the gospel.' He 'throws his whole heart and soul into his work.. He 'forgets himself and thinks only of his subject.' He has a 'demonstrative soul' and power enough, but not mouth enough, to express it. . . . He uses good rhetoric and writes a good sermon, and it has been long enough since he was weaned by the theological seminary for him to dispense the sincere milk of the Word without depending exclusively upon his volume of theological lectures for it. . . . And yet this elaborately and expensively equipped preacher is afflicted with, and afflicts his hearers with, one of the most defective and therefore ineffective styles of elocution known to public speaking. His elocutionary instinct and judgment and taste are all at their lowest point of development."

This quotation is not given for the purpose of discouraging any one, but to incite all who would make "full proof of their ministry" to exercise all diligence in their oratorical

development and culture. Those who conscientiously apply themselves to this work, no matter how long they may have been in the ministry, or what bad habits of speech they may have fallen into, will be surprised agreeably at the beneficial results experienced from this discipline.

The Church of to-day, and the Church of to-morrow, demand a high standard of sacred oratory. Let the ministry respond cheerfully to this call. Anointed in the school of the Holy Ghost and disciplined in the school of the orator, the preacher will prove himself a prophet of the Highest, a spokesman for God.

A SERMON.

BY REV. S. SCHILLINGER, A. M., WEST ALEXANDRIA, O.

(Matt. 25, 31-46.)

DEARLY BELOVED:— Man is prompted constantly by his arrogant reason to demand from God recognition of his works. This statement is verified by the Pharisee who went up into the temple to pray. Luke 18, 11-12. This arrogant spirit manifests itself not only in the Pharisee, but in many professed Christians. When they meditate on their relation to a righteous God, instead of thinking about Christ, their only Mediator, Substitute and Savior, they soliloquize something like this: "We have not been such bad people; we have not stolen, committed adultery, murder or swindled; indeed, we have often given to the poor, helped to further God's Kingdom and attended divine services quite regularly; therefore, we must certainly be acquitted before God and pronounced just." It is so natural for man to fall into the error of the Pharisee that the great danger cannot be sufficiently counteracted. Just as they who preach must be constantly on their guard lest they forget to preach Christ and Him crucified, so must all be on their guard lest they consider the basis of their final acquittal before God their own works instead of the merits of Christ apprehended by faith. May God give us grace to consider in the light

of His Word OUR FINAL ACQUITTAL, which has (1) *not our works for its basis, but* (2) *the merits of Christ apprehended by faith.*

When proud reason learns that works do not merit the forgiveness of sin and salvation it at once becomes offended. Its quick retort is: "Why, then, perform good works? Why go to church and diligently work to spread the kingdom of Christ?"

One reason why good works must be performed is because God is well pleased with them, and because He has commended them. An obedient child will always try to please its father; thus we, as humble and obedient children, will always try to please our Heavenly Father. We go to church because we know that God wants us to go, and that we may learn what great good He has done for us. By our good works we glorify Him. "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Matt. 5, 16. In fact, everything the Christian does, whether it be going to church, helping to extend God's kingdom, tilling the soil, following a trade or profession, he does to the glory of God. "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." 1 Cor., 10, 31. "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him." Col. 3, 17. "It is taught further that good works should and must be performed, not with a view of placing confidence in them as meriting grace, but in accordance with His will and for the glory of God." (Augs. Con., Art. 20.)

A second reason why good works must be performed is that our faith in Christ may be manifested. A good tree brings forth good fruit. (Matt. 7, 17.) It cannot do otherwise. (V. 18.) The Christian is the good tree, and his good works are the fruit. Where there are no good works there is no faith in Christ, and there can be no Christian. "Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, thou hast faith and I have works; show me thy faith without works, and I will show thee my faith by

my works." James 2, 17, 18. "We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2, 10. What are good works? They "are actions of the regenerate, performed by the power of the Holy Spirit, proceeding from true faith, conforming to God's commandments and designed solely to glorify God and manifest due gratitude." (Dict. Cat., p. 76.) Though the word *faith* is not mentioned in the words of our text, it underlies all the works there spoken of by the Savior, and they are noted simply and solely as the fruit of faith.

A third reason why good works must be performed is to manifest our gratitude to God for the unspeakable blessings He has bestowed upon us. Who can meditate upon the great and stupendous work God has accomplished for the eternal salvation of his soul and not lift up his heart in thanksgiving and gratitude to God? When we consider rightly God's great work for us poor fallen creatures our hearts must be filled to overflowing with gratitude.

If we ascribe any other office to good works than that of manifesting faith to the glory of and gratitude to God, we are treading upon forbidden ground. The humble Christian does not expect to accomplish any more, and he accomplishes that very imperfectly. But that does not frighten him, for he relies upon God's promises. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." Rom. 8, 33. Just as soon as works are spoken of as the basis of our acquittal or justification the Christian's heart must be filled with fear, for he knows that God requires a perfect satisfaction, but he and all his works are very imperfect. "Now it is faith which relies on the mercy of God and His Word, and not upon works. If we believe that faith can rely both upon God and the works of men at the same time, we certainly do not understand what faith is. The alarmed conscience cannot be appeased by its own works, but must cry for mercy; and there are no other means by which it can be consoled and relieved but the Word of God." (Apol. Augs., p. 185.) Let us not rob

God of His glory by making our works the basis of our final acquittal and thus fall into idolatry. "Confidence in our own fulfillment of the law is pure idolatry, even blasphemy against Christ, and it must finally fail and lead us to despair." (Apol. Augs., p. 187.)

Whilst it is indeed true that our text lays some stress upon works, it can readily be seen that it does not make works the criterion by which we are to be judged. This is quite clear from the reply of the righteous when the Savior said: 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was in prison and ye came unto me;" for they said: "When saw we Thee an hungered and fed thee; or thirsty and gave Thee drink? When saw we Thee a stranger and took Thee in; or naked and clothed Thee? Or when saw we Thee sick or in prison and came unto Thee?" They had done these works unconsciously. Had they expected to be acquitted or justified by them they would not have forgotten them so easily. That is not human nature. They would have been as ready as the Pharisee to rehearse them.

The Scriptures never contradict themselves. If it be claimed that, according to the words of our text, our works are the basis or ground of our acquittal before God, then they contradict the Word elsewhere. "But we are all an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all fade as a leaf." Isa. 64, 6. Here the prophet is not speaking simply of the deeds of the law, but also of the fruits of faith, if they be made the ground or basis of our justification or acquittal before God. "I will declare thy righteousness and thy works; for they shall not profit thee." Isa. 57, 12. "But which of you, having a servant ploughing, or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, go and sit down to meat, and will not rather say unto him, make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself and serve me till I have eaten

and drunken, and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? Doth he thank that servant because he did the things which were commanded him? I trow not. So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say: *We are unprofitable servants;* we have done that which was our duty to do." Luke 17, 7-10. The unprofitable servant represents us. He does not even receive thanks from his master, nor should we look for thanks from our God if we have the true spirit of humility, much less expect to be justified or acquitted on the basis of our works.

He who maintains acquittal upon the basis of his own works smites the Savior in the face; indeed, he has no Savior; his works have become his god and savior; he is an idolater. Even works which are the fruit of faith cannot become the basis of our acquittal. In Dietrich's Catechism, p. 77, the question is asked: "Why must we do good works?" Answer: "Not that we may by them atone for our sins and merit eternal life; for Christ alone has made atonement and merited for us life everlasting." Paul says: "For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10, 2-4. The apostle would here say that they who expect to be justified or acquitted upon the basis of their works have no use for Christ. In the light of Scripture good works are never performed with that end in view. The Scriptures emphasize works simply and solely as the fruit of faith. That is the sense in which the Savior speaks of them in the words of our text. This is evident from the fact that He says to those on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, *inherit* the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Property inherited is not earned. The works afterward ascribed to the blessed of their Father can never be the cause of their distinction; otherwise it would not be inherited. This truth Paul em-

phasizes also when he speaks of Christians as heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. Rom. 8, 17. The word *inherit* "primarily alluding to property received from a father or ancestor represents the believers as *children* of God." (Luth. Com., p. 285.) It is true works are now mentioned in vv. 35, 36; but "the doctrine implied is the following: 'A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.' (Rom. 3, 28; Gal. 2, 16; Eph. 2, 8, 9.) This justifying faith, however, is a living or active faith, a nominal faith which has not power to produce fruit=works is of no value; faith is made perfect (demonstrated) by works (James 2, 22) in the sense that a true faith cannot possibly exist without producing as its evidence the holy life described in Rom. 12, 1, 2, for 'every good tree bringeth forth good fruit' (7, 17); the failure of the latter proves that the former was not 'good.' Hence Paul says that the law is not made void, but established through faith (Rom. 3, 31)." (Luth. Com., p. 285.)

That our final acquittal is not based upon our works is furthermore clear from the parable of the laborers in the vineyard. Those who worked through the heat of the day expected to receive more, but every man received a penny. Now, whilst the penny does not represent eternal life, but simply the means of grace, it goes to show, however, that the householder made no distinction among them on account of their works. Their works were not the criterion by which judgment was passed. If so, justice would have demanded that the first should have received more.

The statement, "The acquittal shall be pronounced according to the law of works," sounds not only un-Lutheran and unorthodox, but it is un-Lutheran and unscriptural, because it militates against the cardinal doctrine of God's Word and of our Church, viz., the doctrine of *justification.* Our Church has always been exceedingly careful to preserve as the apple of the eye the great and vital doctrine of *justification,* and the Savior says: "He that believeth and is baptized," and not he that performs works, "shall

be saved." Of course, good works must follow saving faith, but they cannot be the ground or basis of our justification or acquittal. Every conception making our salvation dependent in any way upon our life and works bears refutation upon its very face, and must be branded as work-righteousness pure and simple.

But what do passages of Scripture emphasizing good works mean if they dare not in any case be considered even a part of the ground or basis of our acquittal or justification? They mean no more and no less than that where they do not exist faith does not exist. Jno. 5, 28, 29, is one of the passages the advocates of salvation by good works love to cite. It reads: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." This means no more than that they who have proven their faith in Christ by their good works shall receive the reward of grace, eternal life; and they who have proven their unbelief by their evil works shall receive their damnation. If we would not violate the analogy of faith, that is the only construction to be put upon that passage. Matt. 16, 27, is another one of their favorite passages: "And then He shall reward every man according to his works." But here again the heart permeated by faith in Christ, having made Christ's merits his merits, is the condition. Again Paul says: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5, 10. Taking this passage in its connection it can easily be seen what the apostle means. Just above he says: "For we walk by faith, not by sight" (v. 7); and the works mentioned in the tenth verse are simply and solely the fruit of faith; they prove that faith, which has laid hold of Christ, exists. This passage, as well as all others, speaking of man's works when he shall appear before the bar of God, is far from saying that he shall be acquitted or justified upon the basis of his works.

"The good or bad quality of men's work depends entirely on the relation of the life of man to the life of Christ (Ch. 9, 11). Christ for us, our justification, means, on the one hand, the remission of all sin, and on the other, postulates, demands newness, goodness of life in every deed done in the body. The entire activity of all men, in their relation to Christ, is what the apostle has in mind, not as the ground of salvation, but as the measure of reward or punishment. It is either good or bad. In Christ it is good, out of Christ it is bad." (Luth. Com., p. 217.) It is not necessary to quote any more passages seemingly setting forth that man's works have something to do with his acquittal or justification; they all have their center in the great Fountain-head, which is Christ, and His merits.

This brings us to consider

II. *That Christ's merits apprehended by faith, are the only basis of our acquittal.*

Everything Christ accomplished from His birth to his resurrection constitutes His merits. When He said upon the cross, "It is finished," the whole work of redemption was accomplished, and the entire debt of our sins was paid. His resurrection and ascension do not belong to the work of redemption, although they are absolutely essential to our eternal happiness. They are the seals He set upon His great work. The plan of redemption was laid before the foundations of the world. God did not need man to help to lay the plan and He does not need him to help to execute it. The entire Old Testament history is the preparing of a people to receive the Messiah when He should come. As soon as He came He began to fulfill the perfect law of God, which man could not fulfill, and which tsood irrevocably against him. Christ began furthermore at once to suffer for man's transgressions. His humble birth, Hih circumcision, His flight into Egypt, were great suffering for us. He was the only man since sin came into the world who could fulfill the divine law perfectly. He fulfilled it for us, and by faith His fulfillment becomes our fulfillment. He became a perfect Substitute for us. When our righteous God demands from

us a perfect fulfillment of His perfect law, we need only to cling by faith to Christ, our perfect Substitute. "But when the fulness of time was come God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. 4, 4, 5. How can it be more clearly stated that Christ, the Son of God and the Son of the Virgin Mary, is the fulfillment of the law for us, and that through His fulfillment we are redeemed? This is a great and unspeakable comfort, that we know the law can no longer condemn us who are in Christ our Substitute. That we are no longer under the condemnation of the law is clear from what Paul says to the Romans: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifest, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3, 21-23.

Not only did Christ fulfill the law for us, but through His innocent sufferings and death He paid the debt of our transgressions. He did this work alone and there were none to help Him. "I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me." Isa. 1, 3. The work of redemption is alone the basis of our acquittal, and that work Christ accomplished without the assistance of any one. Upon this work, and upon this alone, our acquittal, justification and salvation depend. In discussing the ground of the sinner's justification, Dr. Loy says in his excellent little book: "Justification," p. 50. "The ground of the divine declaration which sets the sinner free from the penalty of his sin, cannot be found in himself; it must be sought in something exterior to him. It is imposisble that a declaration which affirms the sinner to be just, while he is in his nature unjust and is not by the justifying act rendered otherwise, should be made without some ground upon which to base it. God is just, and yet He is the justifier of the sinner. The justice of God and His justification of the sinner re-

quire reconciliation in our thoughts. Upon what ground is the sinner, who is confessedly worthy of condemnation, *acquitted?* Such a ground the Scriptures set before us in the redemption through Christ, as infinite grace devised and executed the wonderful plan. The seeming contradiction which is involved in the proposition that God justifies the unjust, is completely reconciled in the consolatory statements of the Gospel concerning the merits of Jesus as availing for our salvation." That Christ has done the work, which is the ground of our acquittal, is clear from the words of the apostle: "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. 3, 24.

Now the merits of Christ are apprehended by that God-given power which is called *faith,* and pertaining to our acquittal, justification and salvation; the apprehension of Christ's merits is faith's only office. It is simply the hand which lays hold of salvation already acquired by Christ. The "Formula of Concord" says, p. 630: "Concerning the righteousness of faith before God, we believe, teach and confess unanimously, according to the preceding summary of our Christian faith and confession, that poor sinful man is justified before God—that is, absolved and declared free from all his sins and from the sentence of his well-deserved condemnation, and is adopted as a child and an heir of eternal life—without any human merit or worthiness, and without any antecedent, present or subsequent works, out of pure grace, for the sake of the merit, the perfect obedience, the bitter sufferings and death, and the resurrection of Christ our Lord alone; whose obedience is imputed unto us for righteousness." Faith is absolutely essential to our acquittal, justification and salvation, but it is not the basis or ground. "To declare, I say, at this time His" (Christ's) "righteousness; that he might be just and the juctifier of him which*believeth in Jesus.*" Rom. 3, 26. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Rom. 4, 4, 5. It is counted unto him for right-

eousness, since by faith he possesses the righteousness of Christ. "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. by what law? Of works? Way: but by the law of faith." Rom. 3, 27. These passages set before us clearly the office of faith. It does not merit the forgiveness of sins and salvation; to merit that is Christ's work. Strictly speaking, faith cannot be called the cause of our salvation. If it may be called a cause at all, it is simply the instrumental cause (causa instrumentalis). We must be careful not to ascribe any more to faith than simply the condition of our salvation. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Jno 3, 16. Here the condition is that the sinner *believe*. "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16, 16. In conclusion, we would yet append the definition of faith from Dietrich's Catechism, p. 75. "Faith is that act of the soul by which, having known the truth of God's Word, it confidently, by the power of the Holy Ghost, lays hold of the grace and mercy of God set forth in the Gospel promise, for the purpose of obtaining eternal life."

May God help us ever to adhere to the cardinal doctrine of justification and salvation through the merits of Christ apprehended by faith, which gives God the glory forevermore! Amen.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

BY REV. J. E. KIEFFER, A. B., CHARLESTON, W. VA.

"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28, 18-20.

Such is the royal mandate and promise which Jesus, as the King of kings, gives us a last, parting message, and

therefore most important declaration, to His subjects, authorizing and instituting, defending and making a sacred duty of His Church the work of Christian missions. These few farewell words of our Lord Jesus Christ we might aptly term the Constitution of His Kingdom on earth, which is propagated and preserved by means of Christian missionary activity, or as we may also term it, the work of evangelization. In this short regal testament of Jesus to His Church all missionary enterprise finds its divine institution and power, its scope and purpose, its means and promise.

The fundamental character of the Christian religion makes missionary work one of its fundamental principles and a self-evident duty. The missionary movefment and activity of the Christian religion had its birth in the birth of the Christian Church. The very nature of Christianty makes missionary work an essential feature n the realization of its object. Above all, the fact dare not be lost sight of that the Christian religion is universal in its scope. It is not a national, racial, nor yet a class-distinguishing, but in every respect a universal religion. It aims at winning subjects for the Kingdom of Christ from "the uttermost part of the earth." The Christian Church must necessarily be a missionating church. It is therefore quite natural that with its establishment should also be given by its Founder a direct command to missionate.

Prior to the faithful and successful prosecution of the Church's missionary duty a proper understanding of the missionary mandate must necessarily be arrived at. We must know what the mission cause and the mission command really enjoin upon us as Christians. We must know what the work of missions embraces and aims at before we can properly carry that work into effect; what means our Master has placed at our disposal. The fundamental motives and general means must determine the general method. The object to be attained must always be kept in view in arriving at the manner of executing a given task.

We must know *what* to do before deciding *how* to do it. Especially is this true of the work of missions. Particularly the ruling motives in the spreading of the Christian religion should be properly interpreted, both because of the importance of the work and because past experience shows how mistaken ideas and plans entertained and carried into effect sadly harm and reduce the results of the work done in the real mission field.

The ruling motives find their expression *theoretically* in the object of missions, *practically,* in the method employed in the realization of this object. But the general principles of practice are greatly determined by the object and aim in view. We shall therefore speak first of the object and means given and then of the method to be employed in the work of missions. We remark, however, that we shall not always attempt to keep these divisions strictly apart, since the one is so essentially contained in the other.

The underlying idea of all true missionary enterprise is a two-fold one. On the part of the Church, as the word 'Mission' already implies, it is a *sending out* — the sending of its trusted embassadors unto heathen people to convert them to Christ. On the part of the missionaries it is that of *bearing witness* — they are to be witnesses unto Christ (Acts 1, 8) who died and arose from death for all men's salvation (cf. e. g. Acts 2, 22-24; 3, 15; 4, 10; 10, 38-40; 13, 26. 28. 30.) These two ideas are the embodiment of Christ's missionary command which must be the basis of all missionary work.

The command of Jesus to *go* is subordinate to the command to teach and to baptize i. e. to evangelize the nations. It comes first only in time. It is preliminary to the purpose in view; the whole object of missions is the evangelization of the world. We shall therefore pass that element by without futher discussion, except to remark that it is necessary that missionaries be sent out; for "how shall they believe in Him of whom they have

not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" Rom. 10, 14. They cannot be expected to come to the Church, the Church must go to them.

When now the Church sends out missionaries or when the missionary goes out as an embassador of Christ and His kingdom, the Church, the question must always be, What is the import of my undertaking? We ask in general, What must be the governing motives in the actual spreading of the Gospel?

When the work of the missionary is considered, and we ask, What is the duty of his calling? we answer, that it is nothing less and nothing more than making known the Gospel truth. The missionary has no other calling than to preach and to teach, (including of course baptism as a part of this duty. Missionaries are simply to be witnesses unto Christ, even as He has commissioned them (Acts 1, 8), They are to be witnesses, living witnesses, in word and deed, unto Christ and salvation in His name, and nothing more.

The danger of a missionary failing to fulfill the object of his high calling lies not so much in the mistake of doing too little, if he be sincere, but rather in his attempt to accomplish too much, his seeking to do something, to bring the heathen something, good as it may be in itself, for which he has no calling at all. The missionary has a direct commission from Christ as to what he shall do, and this he must seek faithfully to accomplish, and nothing more. He has enough to do when he aims to accomplish that. He must not overstep his calling. The primary object of every missionary undertaking is to *teach* the nations, and their knowledge of the saving truth will work their conversion. Then baptize and continue to teach them to observe all things which Christ commands.

The object of all missionary enterprise is indeed the evangelization of the nations, which implies not only the redemption of their immortal souls for eternity, but also their redemption from heathen and degrading practices.

and their elevation to a Christian standard of morals and social conditions. But social and political reform is never, or should never be made the *primary object* of the work of missions, but rather the *result.* The aim is primarily not social reform, and a winning of souls for the Kingdom of Christ, which is not external, but internal. Christ's kingdom is to be promulgated. But His kingdom is not an external one. It exists in the hearts of men; it is not an outward form, but an inner reform. It is putting the cart before the horse to say that we must first colonize and civilize the nations before we can christianize them. It is just the reverse. The missionary and not the colonist and merchant must be the pioneer laborer to a successful result for each, as past experience also brings abundant proof. Where commerce and colonization have preceded the Gospel, the work of the missionary upon his later arrival has, as history, shows us, invariably been retarded, the East India Company by no means excepted. The motive at the bottom of it all is not so much the love of humanity as the love of money, and the natives are frequently made the victims of deceptions and impositions, even of personal cruelties. Then, too, wicked practices new to them and degrading influences are introduced very often, which only increase the elready existing evils and which can only be counteracted and safeguarded against by religious education. With all this the native is led to judge Christianity unfavorably from the unfriendly and evil practices of men hailing from a Christian country. Then also, for various reasons, the colonial policy, as an aid to Christianity, has proven an *impractical* one, as we learn, for instance, from the practical experience of the Missionary Society of Hermannsburg, which never sent out its contemplated second colonist-missionary ship.

We must first work upon the people's hearts and their understanding. It is the natural way, it is Christ's way. We must educate them, we must teach them. And Christ's commission enjoins nothing more upon the missionary.

Christian civilization is the result, the natural product of a system of Christian education. It requires instruction and time. We must not try to force Christian forms of society and modes of living upon a people we would Christianize before they are prepared for them. Even as *our* advanced Christian life and ideals are the outgrowth of long years of Gospel influence and enlightenment, so it must also be among other peoples to whom in our day the Gospel is being brought. We must let the fruit appear before we can expect to see it; let it grow and ripen before we expect to gather it. It is the height of folly to ask the heathen to break with their existing, their time-hallowed forms before we have educated them to a point that they will see the superiority of our forms, the inferiority of theirs, and will of themselves replace them, willingly and naturally. And what is more, the missionary by so doing would be undertaking what God has reserved for Himself to accomplish through the workings of the Gospel. The Missionary Society, or its messenger, that makes, besides teaching the Gospel, as a primary object of its undertaking the bringing of so-called civilization unto the heathen is seeking to do what God alone can accomplish. He has not asked it of the Church. When we do more we are overreaching our calling. But He has asked us simply to teach — teach Christ. This we should energetically, faithfully and lovingly do, and prayerfully await the result. Let the Gospel produce its own result. We have the God-given duty to sow and let the harvest to Him who worketh in the hearts of men "both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Phil. 2, 13.

Another fact which all friends and active promoters of mission work should not overlook in considering its object is this that Christ in commissioning the Church to missionate does not enjoin upon the Church the duty to vindicate this command for the sake of vindication. Again, Christ's command itself must decide. We are simply to be its witnesses. We are to carry His name everywhere, spread the cause; but there our duty as well as our ability

ceases. The Savior Himself will attend to that. Therefore He prefaced His proclamation and command with the declaration: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28, 18), and added His divine assurance: "Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28, 20.) The Gospel vindicates itself, ours is the duty of spreading it, making it known. Jesus' last and royal commission (Matt. 28, 28-20; Mark 16, 15; Luke 24, 47; [John 20, 21]; Acts 1, 18) — His last will and testament, as it were — furnishes the evidence of its legitimacy and validity, the proof of its divine origin and power in its continual, yea perpetual results and is not to be found in any brilliant apology which we may offer in its defense. The only effective weapon of defense is to point to its results. 2 Cor. 3, 2. It need not be bolstered up by human wisdom, and should not be. The only successful way to defend the Gospel is to let it defend itself. The truth of Gamaliel's words most fittingly applies: "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it." Acts 5, 38, 39. Let the Gospel defend itself through the results of its being told and taught to the people of the world. It is the "power of God unto salvation." Rom. 1, 16. The seal of validity, proving every missionary's commission a divine one, is stamped upon it in flaming letters of eternal fire by the power of the Gospel to convert despite the opposition of the world. The vindication of Christ's words and name is not the object of sending out His messengers. It is solely to make them known. They afford their own vindication and work their own results in the power of God attached to them.

When then a clear conception has been formed of the real and primary object of the Church's missionary endeavor, what also are some of the rules which the missionary should observe in the actual and practical carrying out of this duty? Can there and should there be any such rules laid down? Must not after all the existing circumstances and environments decide the course to be pursued? It is a fact

that the prevailing situation and co-existing factors go hand in hand with the missionary's activity and must be considered, *dare* not be ignored, as *e. g.*, the civil and mercantile factors in the opening of heathen lands to Christian intercourse and influence. But they can only be of secondary import, and must not lead us to lose sight of the real issue. The missionary cause is an indepent cause — exists for itself, and must never be wholly and solely dependent upon earthly powers. It is true we cannot give laws regulating all details, yet there are certain general facts and principles which we can lay down for observance in all work of Christian missions. They are all based upon Christ's word of command. They can be gleaned in their practical form from the words of Christ's instruction to the first missionaries sent out, and from the 'Acts of the Apostles,' which record the missionary activity of those men of God after our Savior's ascension.

Every active missionary worker should thoroughly acquaint himself with the 'Acts'— the *first history* of Christain missions ever written, and of *the first* missionaries, a fact not to be forgotten, a volume of greatest importance, though covering only the first epoch of the history of missions, which history reaches to the present day — and especially every *Protestant* missionary in outlining the general method to be pursued in the work if his high calling. The missionary *ideal* of the Protestant Church is found in the missionary activity of the Apostolic age, and especially in that of St. Paul. He is the typical missionary. The beginning of Protestant missions was a return to that ideal from the methods of Catholicism, which finds to-day yet, to a great extent, its ideal in the methods of the middle ages. We must study the history of Apostolic missions and their methods. They afford us many valuable hints.

It is not possible here to go into detail, but we will briefly allude to some of the general rules to be kept in mind. In speaking of the manner or method by which the Gospel is to be spread, we call attention, first, to the fact

that it is not to be done by means of worldly weapons. The work is a Gospel-war and that of soldiers of the Cross, but its victories must be won by the sword of the Spirit. The application of external force is a misapplication, it is futile, it is unsanctioned. Force must not be attempted in any case, not even where the legitimate means are employed. The preaching of the Gospel will bring to its messengers the sword (Matt. 10, 34), but it is nevertheless the Gospel of peace, and Christianity must not be spread at the price of blood and coercion. It is with heavy hearts that we must look upon the mistages of zealous but erring missionary workers in this regard in the past history of Christianity. And alas, it is gravely to be feared that by some this same sad mistake is being made at the very present time, if not so much in practice, still in theory.

When Christ said: 'Go!' — He certainly meant that we should go regardless of results, but He also states, at the same time, the only legitimate method and means to be used — teaching and baptism, Word and Sacrament. Jesus' words of commission: "Even as the Father hath sent me, so send I you" (John 20, 21), apply not only to the *fact,* but to the *work* as well, its nature and its means. They are to use those instruments which *He* used, and *as* He used them. They are to preach Christ crucified and resurrected, and by means of conviction anl conversion to bring the unbelieving to faith, and sealing this faith in holy baptism — baptism *into Christ* — continue to educate them to an observance of the Savior's commandments. Matt. 28, 19. 20.

That the first disciples did thus, the "Acts" is replete with instances. Nowhere, on the contrary, do we read that they resorted to external force. They used only those means which the Master used and sanctioned. They preached and baptized. Actively and passibely they were *witnesses* to the sacred truth — witnesses in themselves, witnesses unto Christ, witnesses before others.

That the apostles regarded their calling a duty which, above all, was that *of* testifying, we see already from their selection of a successor to Judas (Acts 1, 22), declaring

that their "must one be ordained to be a *witness* with us of His resurrection," one who by personal knowledge and observation was qualified to testify as well as they to the facts in Christ's ministry and the realty of His resurrection. By witnessing to these facts, and by no force, were the first converts won. And because the Church should be founded on testimony, the first witnesses should be personal ones. Witnessing was the Apostles' method, even as St. Peter said, Acts 10, 39: "We are witnesses of all things which He did." The Apostle used no other means but Christ's.

Not force, but persuasion! Peter's great pentecostal conversions, 3,000 in number, were the result of his *witnessing* (Acts 2), of enlarging Christianity according to methods laid down by Christ, with means given by Christ. We are told that "he lifted up his voice and said unto them," Acts 2, 14; that he said: Ye men of Israel hear these words. 2, 22.

Testifying was always his mode of missionating, of making propaganda for the kingdom of Christ. Witness his sermon in Solomon's porch in the temple Acts 3, 11. 12ff. Also his proclaiming of Christ, when he was held a prisoner before Annas, the High Priest. Chap. 4, 10ff. And his conversion of Cornelius, the first Gentile convert to Christianity. Chap. 10, cf. especially verses 34 and 39.

And what did he proclaim? It was *always*: "Jesus Christ of Nazareth whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead. Acts 2, 22-24; 3, 2; 4, 10; 10, 39. 40.

Then also, let us not forget the example of Philip, the Evangelist, in his conversion of the eunuch. We are told that he "preached unto him Jesus." Acts 8, 35. Nor was this simply one instance. As the first missionary to the people of Samaria he "preached Christ unto them" 8, 5.

And above all, let us not overlook St. Paul, who was also a personal witness, 1 Cor. 15, 8, made such before he became an apostle though it required a miracle of God to do so. He carried on the work of missions so extensively and intensively by no other method and means than preach-

ing and teaching, making known the Gospel of Christ, as we are told: "Paul and Barnabas continued preaching and teaching." Acts 15, 35. Whether Paul tried to convert the Jews in their synagogues or the Greeks on Mars hill, it was by pursuasion and testimony unto Christ.

The Gospel of Christ is not one of force, but of love, and must not be spread by the power of human force, but by the power of divine love working through God's Word, which convicts men of their sins and shows them the way to the saving cross of Christ. In the very fact that the spread of Christ's kingdom is not dependent upon secular power lies the secret of its strength; and the use of such power in its behalf means but to weaken its strength and diminish its results. It is sustained and increased alone by the supreme power of a divine love, which will cause it to remain standing with increased power and glory after every temporal power has been buried in the grave of its own weakness. Love, not force, is its life. Napoleon Bonaparte once said: "Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne, and I myself have founded great empires; but upon what do these creations of our genius depend? Upon force. Jesus alone founded His empire upon love, and to this very day millions would die for Him."

The power of the sword, directly or indirectly, used in the spread of Christ's religion may result in great apparent results; but it will be but a formal Christianity which in reality is merely a "white-washed heathendom." The method of Christian missions must not be a subjugation, but a winning of souls — win them for Christ by Christ-given means.

Another general principle not to be left unheeded is this: that the truth of the saying, *"there is a time for everything"* applies also to missions. Evangelization of the nations is not the work of a day, or a year, or even of a century. Not all the gates to the missionary field are thrown open at once. God in His wisdom and providence opens one after the other. Fields that were effectually closed in ages past are thrown open to-day, and fields that

are still closed to-day, there God will "open a door of utterance," when in His wisdom the proper time has arrived. It is not for us to force a way, where God has not yet seen fit to intervene with His providential powers. One field after another, one nation after another.

Again we have Jesus' words of commission for substantiation. Ye are to be my witnesses, beginning with Jerusalem, then Judea, Samaria, Galilee, etc., unto the uttermost part of the earth is the substance of His command. Cf. Luke 24, 47; Acts 1, 8. When among a people the "fulness of time," as it were, has arrived, there we are then to labor with a will, and there the Lord wants substantial lasting work done, not simply a smattering. When we have become ready and able to give proper attention to another, God will also have another field in readiness. There is never a lack of missionary opportunities. And when God has some great work ready to be done, He will also raise up some great man or men able for it. And God will likewise find and designate the proper way.

Was it not so in the days of Apostolic missions? Had not God made ready the nations to receive the Gospel? When He needed a Peter on Pentecost or to receive the first Gentile converts into the Church, did He not find him? or a Paul to preach before peasant and prince from Jerusalem to Rome? "God himself paved the way to missionary enterpise, plowed the mission field and indicated the first mission stations." (Warneck, Hist. Prot. Missions, p. 3). After Christ's ascension the Apostles first preached in Jerusalem on Pentecost. Philip, the Evangelist, was the first to go to Samaria. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, first preached to the Jews, and only when they rejected and showed themselves unworthy did he turn to the Gentiles. Acts 13, 46. When called, he answered the Macedonian cry. Acts 16, 9. And in writing to the Corinthians he stated: "I will not see you now by the way; but I trust to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit. But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost. For a great

door and effectual is opened unto me." 1 Cor. 16, 7-9. He writes to the Colossians; "Pray also for us, that God will open unto us a door of utterance." - 4, 3.

And what is the example which our Lord Himself gives us, *prior* to the giving of His final commission? When He first sent the twelve, He told them: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not." Matt. 10, 5. The time was not yet opportune. "But," He says, "go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." 10, 6.

The Gospel indeed comes to men before they ask for it, but as Jesus did not impose nor wish to impose Himself upon any one, so He further tells His disciples that where they have opportunity they shall preach, but where people will not receive them, and show themselves unworthy, they shall "shake the dust off their feet." 10, 14.

There is a time — it is God's indicated time, not the world's ready reception. Some nations as well as individuals — will reject and show themselves unworthy. But there are always others who are willing and receptive, though they have not asked for it. There God has opened a door. There go! As St. Paul exhorts, we are to pray that God will open a door of utterance. But we are to let God open it. We must abide God's time, and then, "preach, saying: the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

A further rule for general observance and of particular importance is that the work of evangelizing a heathen people should proceed from single, *individual conversions*, the work of purely religious means and motives, to the final embodiment of the whole. It is wrong to make a people as a whole first nominal Christians by coercive or intimidating methods, political or otherwise, and then seek to make of the individuals heart-Christians, as has in some instances been done already. To begin with at least, we must work upon the individual; we must proceed from and with individual conversions. These first-fruits of the Gospel must then form the nucleus of a Christian body which will in time, adding to it one after another, increase

until it permeates the people as a whole, affecting not only their religious life and forms, but also their social and political conditions. We must work from a point as a center to the circumference.

Three stages, says Prof. Warneck (Hist. of Prot. Missions, p. 4), are to be distinguished in a mission period: 1) individual conversion, the gathering here and there of small congregations; 2) extension of the congregation, assisted by native converts; 3) general evangelization, including also the adoption of Christian forms and standards in the social and political domain.

Individual conversion was also the first work of Apostolic missions. In fact, all of it was. And then by gradual assimilation in the post-Apostolic age the numbers and influence of Christianity grew to such proportions, both in religion and society as such, that under Constantine the Great also the political forms were absorbed, and the religion of Christ who proclaimed the official religion of the State. So that in somewhat less than three centuries after the first missionary sermon was preached on that memorable Pentecost day, the first State Church of Christianity became a reality. [Whether the government of a people should in its forms be Christian officially or only in its expressions; or, to state it from the viewpoint of religion, whether there should be a State Church or a free Church, is a question to be considered for itself.] We refer to this historical fact simply to show that it is true of missionary enterprise as elsewhere, that it is the little things that count, that small and ofttimes discouraging beginnings have with God's blessing, lage endings. Verily, "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

In summing up, we may say, that *the* fundamental principle, the one great object of all Christian missionary effort is, "to give knowledge of salvation to the people by the remission of their sins." Luke 1, 77. The cause is an eminently practical one, aiming at one grand object: to bring the nations of the earth, as individual souls, to give answer to the question, which, at some time in its exist-

ence, sooner or later, every indivdual soul must answer. before God, "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He," That is the Church's mission; its realization is to be attained by the means and methods prescribed by the Master in His last royal proclamation. It is our duty to help *preach* His Gospel, and to help *teach* the nations to observe His commands.

Look on the fields, they are white to harvest. John 4, 35. "The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few." Let us pray the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth laborers into His harvest. Luke 10, 2.

THE PASTOR AS A STUDENT AND WRITER.*

BY REV. J. G. TROUTMAN, A. B., CIRCLEVILLE, O.

We hear a great deal about the "dead line" in the ministry. In all probability there are congregations, of which it must be said to their shame, that they unwillingly retain and refuse to call faithful pastors on account of their advanced age. It is certainly to be deplored, if a congregation can not see, or be made to perceive, that an old, experienced pastor can render more proficient service than a young inexperienced brother in the ministry. But it seems to us that the so-called "dead line" in the pastoral office has been greatly exaggerated. Quite, often the "dead line" is established not by the congregation, but by the pastor, through his lack of faithful, conscientious, studious application. His services are not desired, not because he is old, but his sermons are too antiquated. The sacred productions which he delivers Sunday after Sunday may have been in the barrel so long that they have become musty; and preached so often that they have lost much of their force and freshness. The preacher may try to excuse his lazy intellect and ease his guilty conscience by the thought that the same old truths are to be preached again, and

*A Conference paper.

again, but he should remember, old sermons never. The reason why some preachers reach the "dead line" so soon is because they reach the study so seldom. There is undoubtedly much truth in what one of our professors has repeatedly stated: "Our pastors do not study enough." In order that this subject might receive some attention by this conference the following subject was assigned:

THE PASTOR AS A STUDENT AND WRITER.

We shall attempt to elucidate this thought under three heads: I *The obligation,* II *the field,* III *the method.*

It may seem unnecessary to state to a body of intelligent Christian men, that they are under obligations to study and write. The pastor owes it to himself. The pastor who contents himself with the knowledge obtained in the college and seminary will practically reach the "dead line" long before he reaches the age of fifty. If he does not use his brains, his books, and his pen he will retrograde instead of advance in intellectual attainments.

A minister of the gospel should be ambitious to succeed in the ministry. He ought to be desirous to attain, yea raise the standard of the highest and most important vocation on earth. Be determined that this office shall not deteriorate, through lack of studious application on his part. A preacher is, or at least ought to be, among the intelligent leaders of the community. In order to attain and retain a position of honor and influence among the cultured people in a locality, it will be necessary that he spend hours in his study, praying, thinking, reading and writing.

The pastor's duty toward the Church makes it obligatory for him to study and write. He owes it to the congregation he is serving. A congregation is justified in desiring, yea, in demanding good sermons from the pastor. No one enjoys listening to a poorly prepared preacher. One feels uneasy and embarrassed when the preacher hesitates, stammers, halts and repeats, or vociferously pronounces words and says nothing. It is actually a relief when

he says amen. Can you blame people for not wanting to go to church if they can, by remaining away, escape this mental agony? To produce good sermons is an art which requires hard study and conscientious preparation. A preacher ought not extemporize unless it is absolutely necessary, which is very seldom. The plea of no time to prepare sermons is not valid. Take time. Sermonizing is the preacher's business and the most important work he has to perform. Congregations are usually willing to overlook many shortcomings in their pastor if he preaches good sermons. The minister that studies his text thoroughly, and writes his sermons carefully will be appreciated by his people, although he may be very much dissatisfied with his own productions.

The pastor needs to study and write, for he owes it to the Church at large. Ample opportunity is afforded him to benefit the Church by applying his brains and pen in supplying suitable literature for our people. Literary contributions for our periodicals are eagerly solicited, and thankfully received by the various editors. We are undoubtedly safe in saying that of the 450 pastors in Joint Synod less than twenty-five supply our periodicals with nine-tenths of the reading matter. The chief business of the remaining 400 or more seems to be to criticise these papers, which is more easily done than supplying the necessary articles for publication. We also need more good books, especially in the English language, for our family libraries. Our people, and especially the younger generation, read too much sectarian literature, and thus imbibe the sectarian spirit instead of true Lutheranism. Pastors with gifted pens can greatly benefit the Church in this direction.

Especially should the pastor remember that he is under obligations to God to study and write. He who has endowed the pastor with mental powers, called him to such an important office, provided ample opportunity for the development and salutary use of his gifts, demands something of him. Our blessed Savior commended those who

properly used their talents, but vehemently condemned that individual that hid his talent in the earth. Paul writes to Timothy: "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." The rich blessing God bestows upon hard work in the ministry, as well as the grave responsibility and accountability of the pastoral office should move us to work hard, earnestly, and conscientiously in the Master's service.

II. *The Field.*— The field in which the pastor needs to study and write is indeed a large one, but he need not despair on that account. Theology should be given first place, and the Bible be the chief book. It is especially necessary that the preacher familiarize himself with the theology of his own Church. The Lutheran theologian has a vast and fruitful field, from which he may glean most precious fruit. To gather and store in his mind some of this fruit is the duty of a Lutheran pastor, which truly requires diligent application, but brings rich rewards.

Nor is it sufficient for a Lutheran pastor to acquaint himself with Lutheran theology. A wide-awake minister will read and study sectarian theology. This will benefit him in many ways. It greatly increases his general intelligence; it gives him a splendid opportunity for keen intellectual discernment, makes him more competent in combating false doctrine and malicious practice, strengthens his faith in our own confessions so that he is not only a Lutheran because he was baptized and confirmed in a Lutheran church and studied theology in a Lutheran seminary, but is a Lutheran from conviction.

It is also necessary for a faithful pastor to give some attention to anti-Christian literature, in order that he may wage a sucessful fight against infidelity, lodgery, so-called Christian Science, spiritualism, rationalism and the various other isms that pervade almost every community with their pernicious influence. To combat these evils intelligently and successfully one must acquaint himself with their spirit and teaching. Many a pastor has waged a losing fight in

a good cause through ignorance of the enemy's position and weapons. To attack these citadels of satan properly, and carry on the fight valiantly necessitates careful campaigning in the study.

The pastor must also have some secular knowledge to be successful in his vocation. He comes in contact with cultured people of the world, of other churches, and of his own church, who naturally expect him to be intelligent. It is necessary for thorough work in our profession that he keep up the study of the classics. The intrinsic benefit derived from being familiar with the best literature is apparent to every educated person. He must have some knowledge of science in this socalled scientific age, in order to be able to distinguish between true science and that which is called the result of scientific research, but which is simply rot. What pastor has not felt the need of knowing something about art; and how many deplore the fact that they knew so little about music. While many a preacher may spend too much time perusing the daily paper and various magazines, it certainly is necessary that he keep abreast with the times and familiarize himself with the current events of the day. Of course, it can not be expected that a busy pastor be a walking encyclopedia, especially if he is giving his attention to a certain branch of learning. But even though he be a specialist, that will not prevent him from having a wide range of intelligence. Observation clearly shows that the specialist knows a few things in other lines also.

III. *The Method.*— Undoubtedly much force is spent and many precious moments wasted on account of the lack of methodical arrangement in the prosecution of work. "No time," is usually the excuse given for dilatoriness in the study. The plea of no time has been repeated so often that it has seemingly become contagious. Would it not, in many instances, be nearer the truth to say, no desire? It is absolutely necessary that the pastor spend sufficient time in his study. This can usually be done without neglecting important pastoral duties, if one's work is properly ar-

ranged and systematically performed. It may possibly necessitate shorter pastoral calls, which is not a drawback, for long pastoral calls are generally an abomination. It may deprive the pastor and his family of a good dinner and necessitate rising a little earlier in the morning, but it will amply repay all these sacrifices, for he will then have an opportunity to feed his mind.

Not only should the pastor have time to study and write, but to do good work he must have definite hours for mental application. These hours will depend upon and be controlled by circumstances and conditions. In our estimation the forenoon is the best time for study. The mind being rested, is in a condition for profound meditation and quick activity. " Experience teaches that if people have once learned that their pastor has certain hours for work in his study, they will usually respect these hours by non-interference, and thoughtful people will esteem him for his integrity and industry.

Undoubtedly, many pastors are somewhat hampered in methodical research on account of the lack of books. A good library is very desirable and advantageous for thorough work; but a large library does not always indicate that there is a great student about the premises. To have few books and to know them is far more commendable than to have hundreds of volumes, the leaves of many not being cut. Even the pastor with a small library has no legitimate excuse for not studying and writing. The Bible is a library in itself. It contains the best exegesis, dogmatics, ethics, pastoral theology, symbolics, etc. No history can be compared with it. No science so deep, no philosophy so penetrating, no literature so grand as that found in the Holy Scriptures. It is a Book which none of us studies sufficiently. In our day we study too many books about the Bible, but do not study the Bible enough.

The pastor must have system in his study. He must concentrate his efforts on one branch at a time, and keep at it, if he hopes to accomplish something worthy of admiration. Divided efforts in the study invariably lack pro-

fundity. In our estimation it is beneficial to follow a course of study. While there may be some objections raised to the post-graduate course which has been mapped out by Dr. Weidner on the ground that it requires too much for thoroughness, it certainly is a great help in directing the study of the young pastor. If a post-graduate course would be mapped out by our theological professors, it would be greatly appreciated by many and would benefit the young pastor in many ways. It would be a guide for him in his study, be an incentive to study, save him much money which he unwisely spends on practically useless books, and assist him in procuring a good library.

A great deal more might be said on this subject of a pastor and his study, but if we have suceeded in contributing something toward stimulating the discussion of this question our efforts will not be entirely in vain.

THE LEADING IDEAS OF JUDGES.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

The book of Judges is not a work written in accordance with the principles and canons of ordinary secular historiography. The attempt to make it such at all hazards is one of the characteristics of the modern methods of subjective and radical criticism and a *proton pseudos* of the Wellhausen reconstruction scheme. The book shares with other historical writings in both the Old and the New Testament the peculiarity that it does not aim to give a complete report of the period it covers according to historic pragmatism, but only such selections from the events which will serve the special purpose of the writer. The gospels are not biographies of Christ, not even the Synoptics, but only chrestomathies from the sayings and doings of Jesus of Nazareth that will demonstrate the special purpose which each of the Evangelists had in view. To find fault with the historical books of the Scriptures for not being what they do not intend and claim to be is the special distinction

of the naturalizing school of the O. T. critics of the day, who would place these writings and the contents, both as literary productions and as religious books, on one and the same Procrustean bed prepared by a subjective philosophy of what all religious development, and also that of Israel, *must* have been.

Judges shares with other historical books of the Old Testament the character of being a "prophetic" writing. The compilers of the Old Testament Canon evinced their appreciation of the real contents and purpose of the work by placing it in this rubric and class. Its contents show, without any reasonable cause for doubt, that the author aimed to make it one part and portion of the record of Israel in its theocratic development under the direction of Jehovah in the land that had been given to the people. It is thus intrinsically a continuation of the book of Joshua, although from an entirely different author or authors. The writer proceeds from the premises that he is composing a development in which not only the ordinary factors and forces that control the ups and downs of history are operative, but that the chief agency in this historical unfolding are the word and the will of Jehovah, and that even the ordinary laws and course of nature are subject to His interference in case that such interference serves the higher theocratic purposes of the God of Israel, who is also the Lord of heaven and of earth. However much modern critics may sneer at "Heilsgeschichte," or history of redemption and salvation as constituting the real backbone of the entire Old Testament literature, and however much the attempt is made to reject this characteristic feature and deprive this history of its *sui generis* element and put it on an equality, without generic difference or distinction, with secular history, it will ever remain true that these records, and among them the Book of Judges, can only by the most radically violent critical processes be made to tell their story in accordance with this scheme. As the book reads, it is evident that the author wrote prophetic history and intended to do so. The history of Jehovah's dealings with the people of

His choice during the national formation period in the land of promise constitutes the burden of his story.

More specifically the author of Judges covers this period in accordance with a regularly repeated and recurring series of causes and effects. Indeed, no other work in the Scriptures shows such a monotony in the methods of telling its story as is the case here, the books of Kings not even being an exception. During a period of more than three hundred years and the leadership of fourteen Judges (including Abimelech), from Othiel to Samson, the process illustrated by the vicissitudes of all these years is that of rebellion and unfaithfulness on the part of the people against Jehovah, punishment by Jehovah through the Gentiles whom Israel had permitted to remain in the land, followed by repentance on the part of the people, and finally deliverance through some new person chosen by Jehovah for this very purpose. This order of succession of events is the one and only method observed by Judges from which there is no departure or of which there is no variation. That this was the real and historically correct and true order of historical events we have all reasons to believe. It certainly is in exact conformity with the religious principles inculcated by the Law, and even if we were, with the Wellhausen school, to transfer to the post-exilic period the Levitical portions, it is yet in harmony with what remains as the oldest religious teachings of the people. It is in the same way in perfect harmony with the pragmatism of the later history of Israel, showing that Jehovah at all times dealt in exactly the same way with His people. It is also exactly in harmony with the principles of the New Testament faith and the way and manner in which God deals with His Church and with His people at all times. The records of Judges are accordingly in agreement with the principles that have prevailed in the Kingdom of God on earth from the very outset, and that still prevail. Why this process should be unhistoric in this period of Judges is very difficult to see unless it be in the interest of a conception of religion and of religious development that is naturalizing

and naturalistic and has no room for such factors as sin, repentance and divine pardon and deliverance. The historical scheme that here prevails is indeed in a certain sense subjective, but it is a subjectivism founded upon the objective facts of divine revelation and truth. The very fact that in this development the book does not conceal the weaknesses of the people and the elementary and crude character of many of their religious ideas and still more their relatively low stage of morality, which in many ways does not satisfy the ideals of a New Testament Christian, is only that much evidence of the hitsorical correctness of the picture it draws. Only when understood as a part and portion of the theocratic history of Israel can the Book of Judges be properly understood and interpreted.

NOTES.

NEW FINDS IN BABYLONIA.

The expedition to the site of Babylonia sent out by the German Orient-Gesellschaft has, through its leader, Dr. Koldewey, made some interesting repores of its latest finds, which are published in the Mittheilungen, No. 4. The principal work is carried on in the ruins of the "Kasr," or palace, famous as the residence of Nebuchadnezzar and as the place in which Alexander the Great died. On the south side of the north wall a canal 6 metres wide was found, built of brick which bore Arabic seals. Koldewey regards this as the famous East Canal so often mentioned in the inscriptions, and that the letters pressed into the brick are the beginning of the name "Libilhegalla." The excavations of an extension of the Kasr on the east front has led to the discovery of a building which has been identified as the temple Emach of the goddess Ninmach. Groups of rooms surround a courtyard. Under the brick pavement were found, in various localities, clay tablets with the names and wage lists of those engaged on the structure. This is

without doubt the building to which reference is made in other inscriptions, especially a well-known small building-cylinder, where we read: Emach, the temple of Ninmach, in Babylon, I have built over for Ninmach, the princess, the exalted one. I surrounded it with a powerful Kisü of ground-pitch and of bricks." The "Kisü" is no doubt the brick wall surrounding the whole building. Then a clay tablet has been found which contains a hymn in the Sumarian language, with an interline of Babylonian translation (together about 180 lines), and a cylinder of Sardanapalus, on which this King reports that he has erected anew the temple of Ninmach. Further many relief bricks, with parts of the bodies of animals pictured on them, have been unearthed. In the ruins of the walls surrounding the Kasr a number of fragments descriptive of the buildings erected by Nebuchadnezzar were found, containing also important data hitherto lacking in the records of this King. An *en face* image of a goddess, probably that of Ninmach, is also on the list.

The *Mittheilungen* describes also a remarkable inscription presented by Herr Simon to the society, dating from the eighth century and originating in Borsippas. The inscription is now in the Berlin Museum. Its chief interest lies in the formula of a Semitic oath, with which it closes, and which dates from very early times, and of which varieties exist in other Semitic lands. It reads:

"Whosoever breaks this stone tablet with a stone, or burns it with fire, or covers it with dirt, or throws it into the water, or takes it into a dark house where nobody can see it, or erases the name that is written on it and inserts his own, his descendants may the gods, as many of them as have been mentioned on this stone tablet, destroy!"

ANTI-CATHOLIC AGITATION IN THE GREEK CHURCH.

The recent publication of the Oecumenical Patriarch of the Greek Church in Constantinople in a general pastoral letter warning his spiritual children against sending

their children to the schools established by the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church in many of the centers of the orthodox population is the outcome of a tension between the two communions that has been developing for years back. It all springs from the fixed policy of the Vatican, inaugurated as far back as the time of the Crusades, to win over the adherents of the Greek Church to obedience to the Church of Rome, which movement has repeatedly resulted in the formation of "United Churches," generally resulting in the end in total absorption by the Roman Church. In recent decades the national consciousness of the Greeks has become a potent factor and force in the Greek Church, too; it has developed an anti-Roman tendency that is in many cases as pronounced as it is in purely Protestant communions. The Church of Rome has skillfully made use of the ambition for learning and culture that has come with the revival of the Greek nation, and has established schools everywhere throughout the precincts of the Oriental Church. In Athens, Corfu, Syros and many other centers excellent schools, with an extensive curriculum, were founded, and in some cases, as in the girls' school at Tinus, the religious propaganda in favor of the Roman Catholic Church that more and more became a part of the programme of these schools led to repeated conflicts with the Church authorities, and later also with the state. Catholic political powers intervened, so that these institutions were not closed, but can continue their work under certain restrictions. Now the Patriarch has deemed it necessary, publicly and officially, to warn against these schools. Within recent weeks new fuel has been added to the flames by the report, seemingly well founded, that the orders which have been expelled from France, notably the Jesuits, intend to settle down in the Greek territories and engage in proselyting work. Such credence is given to this report that the theological faculty of the University of Athens has addressed a memorandum, written by the famous Church historian, Diomedes Kyriakos, addressed to the government, asking that legal and official steps be taken to prevent the

advent of this unwelcome contingent. The memorandum describes the baneful character and influence of Jesuistic pedagogues and the hatred of this order for the Hellenic Church; at the same time an appeal is made for a stricter supervision of the Catholic institutions already established in Greece, which are regarded as a danger to the national ideals of the race. The determined attitude of the Athenian faculty has made a favorable impression, and there seems to be no doubt that the government authorities will act accordingly.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL
DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH

Edited by Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D., Columbus, Ohio.

VOL. XXV APRIL 1905 NO. 2

CONTENTS

PAGE

EDITORIAL COMMENT. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 65

THE DOCTRINES OF THE SCRIPTURES CONCERNING ORIGINAL SIN. By Rev. A. F. Rohr, A. M..... 76

THE SAVIOR'S NAMES AS RECORDED IN SCRIPTURES. By Rev. Julius Boehmer..... 100

THE CHRISTIAN IN TEMPTATION. By Rev. Fred. W. Rohlfing. 114

THE CONSTANT NEED AND THE WIDE SCOPE OF THE CHURCH'S MISSIONARY WORK. By Rev. M. H. Hockman..... 120

NOTES. By G. H. S..... 125

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN
55-57-59 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, OHIO

THE TEACHERS' ANNUAL

The Sunday School Lessons for the whole year explained in language within the asp of every teacher. The author's object is to make the text of the lessons plain. A ithful use of the "Annual" will richly repay anyone, whether teacher or not.

Price, in substantial board binding, per copy, 75 cents. In lots of six or more, 60 cents per copy, payable in advance. Postage 7 cents extra.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY DR. F. W. STELLHORN,
Professor of Theology in Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

A popular treatise on the four Gospels. For study and devotion. Gives the meang of the text, the history of prominent persons mentioned in the gospels, the topogphy, all in a clear and distinct manner. The highest praise has been bestowed upon is Commentary by able and competent critics.

Plain Cloth, $2.00; Half Leather, $2.50; Morocco, $3.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY

OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH
BY HEINRICH SCHMID, D. D.

TEXT-BOOK. The Lutheran Doctrine in a clear, distinct and comprehensive form.

Bound Durably in Elegant Cloth, $4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIES

Pastors and Teachers and Professors will find it to their advantage to consult e general Catalogue of the Lutheran Book Concern before purchasing what they ed for their libraries. It cannot be expected that all the books mentioned could be pt constantly on hand, but the assurance can be given that all orders will be mptly attended to.

CHURCH RECORDS

Every congregation should keep a complete record of all the pastoral acts and ier important events occurring in the congregation. To this end *Church Records* a necessity. The LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN has them for sale at $3.75.

LL IN ONE VOLUME

are the works of able and competent authors on Theological and Practical jects, covering a large field. We have bound volumes of the COLUMBUS EOLOGICAL MAGAZINE, from 2 to 19, bound durably in half roan at $2.00 per ume. Order complete set and we will furnish same at $1.50 per volume.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXV. APRIL, 1905. No. 2.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

1. IS THEOLOGY A SCIENCE?

The answer to this question depends entirely upon what is to be understood by a science. In the sense in which mathematics, history and kindred disciplines are sciences, theology is not a science. If in the discussion of the facts that belong to a particular sphere of research the mind and its laws are to be the final courts of appeal in determining what a science is and teaches, then theology is not a science. It is the privilege of the secular sciences that they are to investigate truth solely in accordance with the laws by which it is the sphere of mind to judge of facts and evidences and their relations and bearings, although it is not thereby said that this judgment will be correct or that the actual truth will be discovered. If the powers of the mind were perfect and without any limitations, then science would possibly claim, by an induction from the phenomena that naturally group themselves in a particular department, to attain to absolutely reliable results. But just here is the greatest weakness of science in the ordinary sense of the term, which is only made all the greater by the fact that, however much the possibilities of error in scientific deductions and teachings may be acknowledged theoretically, these are never conceded practically. The mistaken conclusions of science are always those of other people, or other generations or other men. Substantially science as it is claims infallibility, although the history of scientific research shows as plainly as anything can that what are the

infallible conclusions of science in one generation constitute the laughing stock of the scientist in the next. The exactness of science is so often its inexactness, that it is a constant surprise that scientific men will not hesitate to make their claims to "sure results" a little more carefully and courteously.

Theology is not a science in so far as neither its materials nor the principles that are to judge of these materials and to decide are the outcome of mental research nor of the nature of the mind. When men now-a-days claim that theology is a science in this sense, with the high ideals of the discovery of the truth as its purpose, the claim is practically in all cases based on the supposition that the facts of theology as such are not given nor that it has been determined outside of human reasoning, how these facts are to be judged. In other words, the claim that theology is a science in the ordinary sense is based on a rationalistic principle. Secular science is and in the nature of the case must be rationalistic; theology in the Biblical sense of the term cannot and dare not be. In this sense theology is Biblical and is based on the given quantities as revealed in the Scriptures, upon which the mind has never the right to sit in judgment or to determine according to its own laws, except by the formal use of its faculties to decide what these facts are to teach and to say. Theology is irrational in the sense that both its contents and its teachings are above reason and contrary to reason, and accordingly deals with higher facts and higher principles than the secular sciences. This again brings with it for theology a higher degree of certainty than any secular science can claim for itself. As it is not controlled by the fallible powers and principles of the human mind, it is not dependent on fallible sources for its material nor upon a fallible agency for its teachings. Its results, if they are really Biblical in contents and character, are absolutely sure, and certain, because it is in both respects based on the infallible word of God. It was from this standpoint that theologians formerly called theirs the science of sciences, in so far as it can furnish certainty in

matters in which the secular sciences, on account of their limitations can give no definite conclusions. Thus if modern natural science thinks itself justified in teaching a natural development in the creation of things and in this way eliminates a personal God from the origin and development of things, theology is in the condition to gainsay this, because on the basis of facts that are taken from a more reliable source than human deductions and reasonings, it knows that these things cannot be so. From this point of view theology is the greatest and the highest of sciences; and the purpose should not be, as is so often the case with timid Biblical students, to make the Scriptural teachings agree with those of the sciences, to reconcile Genesis with Geology, but it should be to make science agree with theology, providing the latter is actually Scriptural teachings, and to make Geology harmonize with Genesis.

But independent of these features of theology, its sure foundation and sure results, it is a science too in this sense of the term that it, with the formal assistance of the human mind and with the aid of those facts which history, archæology, chronology and kindred sciences have developed, systematically to arrange the teachings of the Scriptures. But all this work is simply formal and in no way implies any mastery over the materials or the principles of theology. The Scriptures are not a collection of thetical teachings, but as a rule the dogmas and doctrines of the Word are to be evolved from the historical hull in which they are found is the Apostles and Evangelists. The construction of a Biblical Dogmatics of a Biblical Ethics is a piece of scientific work, and on account of the character of the most of the Biblical books this is an exceedingly necessary scientific process.

But this makes necessary another scientific phase of theology. While in its materials it is a purely reproductive process, giving only and possibly and generally in new form what the inspired writers have said and taught, it is only natural that this reproductive process, which also must arrange in a scientinc form what it produces, can never claim

to have exhausted the Scriptures entirely. In other words, theology is a progressive science, not only in this that it may make new applications of principles that have long since been recognized as Scriptural, but also that, to meet the exegencies of the times, may formulate Biblical principles which had hitherto in this exact form or shape not yet been needed by the church. In this way even new theology in the correct sense of the term may become necessary. In fact, this was the way in which all the dogmatical teachings of the church have been developed during the past nineteen hundred years. Usually over against false interpretations and teachings the Church was compelled to formulate the true principles of the Word, and theological science was accordingly compelled to formulate teachings that had never in that particular shape or with such exactness been taught by the Church, although included in the Church's acceptance of the entire Word as the source of truth and life. The very fact that there are dogmas and doctrines in the Church and that the Church did not and could not rest content with a mere repetition of Biblical truth in Biblical form show that theology has been a progressive science and must continue to be such, unless it wants to become petrified formalism and stale stagnation. Nor is in this connection the difference between principle and application to be overlooked. Principle is the statement of a rule, a definition, a dogma or a doctrine; this becomes application where these rules are applied to concrete and existing things and facts. If the Church declares, on the basis of the first commandment and for other Biblical reasons, that secret societyism is a sin, this is a statement of a principle; but when it declares that Odd Fellows and other organizations are sinful combinations, and a literary society is not, it makes an application of this principle. The theology of the Church has at all times been called upon to enunciate principles and to make applications in accordance with the problems that come to vex and to perplex her, and in this sense even the most conservative theology is a progressive science. For real theology the Scriptures supply both the materials and the principle, but on

this basis theology is indeed reproductive, but reproductive in the sense that it also develops, in new forms and shapes often, the principles of this word and applies them to concrete phenomena. Theology is indeed a science, and that in the highest sense of the term, but it is a science *sui generis* and entirely unique, governed by laws of which other sciences know nothing.

II. HAS THE CHURCH A RIGHT TO REVISE ITS CREED?

A church is known by its creed and confessions. That church which claims to have no creed except the Bible has only added one more creed to those that already exist. Abstractly speaking, the Church should have no creed, and if the ideal state of Christianity were realized there would be none, but all would be a unit in the recognition of the one truth of the Revealed Word. But as the Church has developed the creeds have become the distinguishing marks by which the one group of Christians are to be distinguished from the other. These have become historical entities that mark a certain group of churches. When we speak of the Lutheran church, history shows that those are to be embraced by this term who accept certain symbolical books and a certain system of teachings and the expression of Biblical truth. The same is true of the Calvinistic and the Catholic churches. To change then the creeds or the the confessions which have become the historical distinguishing marks of a church and make it that which it is, is to deprive a church of what makes it a distinct phenomenon in history and to make it something else. As long as there is a distinctively Lutheran church it must have certain distinct confessional characteristics, or it ceases to be the Lutheran church. If the Presbyterian church discards its faith in Calvinisim and in other characteristic teachings it has ceased to be what it has historically been for centuries, and Presbyterianism in the twentieth century is something different from Presbyterianism in the seventeenth century. Creed revision is then not a right that even the unanimous consent of the members of a certain denomination have. A creed or a confession is

the historical distinguishing feature of a denomination and hence cannot be changed.

This does not mean that a church has no right to change its creed or belief. If a denomination has reached the conclusion that its traditional faith is contrary to the Scriptures it has not only the right but the duty to change its faith; but it can not do so and retain its old name. Just as an individual in changing his faith from that of one denomination to that of another goes also from the one communion to the other, and accordingly changes the name of his ecclesiastical affiliation, thus too it is is the correct thing for a body of Christians in changing its belief to change its name also. Old creeds may be wrong, but this does not make it right to give new creeds old historic names. And this brings with it the answer to another problem that is bothering the Protestant churches practically everywhere. What rights has liberal theology in the churches with fixed historical confessions and creeds? In Germany the government goes out from the singular view that both the conservative and the liberal tendencies are to be "recognized" in the theological faculties and in the churches, and as a rule we find side by side with a Bible believing professor a colleague who is radical and neological in all his teachings. This is an exceedingly strange and self contradictory position to take and can be only self destructive compromise, as though a thing can be both white and black at the same time and the Bible can be both the truth and a falsehood at the same time. Truth is only one, and one only and not both of these men can be the exponent of the truth. Singularly and yet naturally the state will not adopt this same principle in the other university faculties. It would never dream of appointing one man to the law faculty who is a defender of the present social order, and place by his side a social democrat or an anarchist whose one object in life and his teachings is to overthrow the present system of society. The state proceeds from the position that the latter has no right to promulgate his doctrine from the university halls which the

state in its present order of things sustains and supports. To permit this would be self destructive and suicide.

Exactly the same principle applies to the liberal or radical on his claims to recognition in the church. He no longer shares the creed of the church and his own creed if it should spread throughout the church would be subversive of the very basis of the church. It would be suicidal for the church to encourage or permit such "tendencies" and "schools" that teach principles inconsistent with its historical position and upon which its whole organization and history is based. If men are in conscience bound to take liberal or radical positions, to deny the Trinity, the Atonement, the Divinity of Christ, and other fundamentals and essentials of historical confessional Christianity, it is their privilege and right so to do; but then they have no further claims on that church whose very foundation is built upon the very doctrines that they antagonize and try to overthrow. It is remarkable that men ask for such privileges in the church and in matters that pertain to the highest interests and concerns of life and eternity, and yet never dream of demanding this in any other organization or society in the world. When a man has ceased to believe in the principles of a certain political party, he needs no' be told to leave it. This he does of his own accord and seeks for more congenial associates. The same should be the case with the radical theologian who has broken with the creed of his church. He is no longer of the church and accordingly is no longer in the church. His rights and privileges are none other than to leave that organization which is based on principles that he no longer shares and to which he is diametrically antagonistic. A church and an individual has a right to change creeds, but only with the proviso that they bring with it a change in their church affiliations.

III. THE ABSOLUTENESS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Only those who are studying carefully and observing closely the ups and downs of religious problems and dis-

cussion have any conception of the fundamental character of the matters under debate. Not only are the special fundamental and essential doctrines, which former generations considered practically settled, put under the critical microscope, nor are only such problems as the character and certainty of Christian knowledge and the foundation of Christian faith called into question, but the entire nature and genius of Christianity are made the objects of attack and doubt. Whatever the vagaries of rationalistic thought may have been in past generations in reference to special doctrines and principles of Christianity, it passed as a matter of course that Christianity was an entirely unique phenomenon in the world of religions, a phenomenon that did not share in the characteristics of any other body of belief claiming to be a religion. But all this is being changed. The naturalistic methods that prevail in the world of thought and are the chief controlling factors in all the departments of learned thought and research, can find no place for any unique or *sui generis* phenomenon, can see no possibility of accepting anything like a revelation or a divine agency that would even possibly interfere with the workings of purely natural laws. From this philosophical standpoit the question of the absoluteness of Christianity become a real problem. Can there really be such an absolute religion, which has the truth as such and which even in its leading elements has the truth to the exclusion of others? Naturally the evolutionary Darwinism of modern philosiphical thought must answer in the negative, Christianity may be and undoubtedly is the best religion extant, but its story and best features are only further developments of truths that in elementary form are to be found elsewhere also. Comparative historical study of the religions of the world is proving a veritable Pandora box of mischievous notions that purpose to put Christianity on a level with other religions, to make it at most and at best the chief among its kind but not one of a kind all by itself. It is this spirit that induces men to compare phenomena in Christianity with those that bear even

the slightest outward resemblance to it in other religions and is just as ready to deduce the teachings of Christianity from those of other religions as it is to see even in true teachings of other religions either a dependence on Christianity or a reminiscence from the oldest revelations given to the first generations of men. This tendency of trying to force Christianity down to the level of natural religion, and then to deprive it of its distinctively revealed and accordingly divine character, is the fundamental motive in the denial of the absoluteness of Christianity. Of course it is perfectly useless to try to convince the protagonist of such a position, as his views are the product of a philosophical system and philosophy is seldom amenable to reason and is generally a purely subjective matter and as such not to be moved or changed by objective argumentation. Philosophy is in itself already a creed and a faith, and a creed and faith are not based on argument or reason but stand on a different foundation. This is true too of Christianity, and the conclusion that Christianity is the one sole and only true faith and creed, and absoluteness of Christianity, is a matter of belief and personal conviction which can be worked in the heart only through the power of the Spirit. As long as haughty reason, which thinks it is a law to itself, has the control of the heart and mind of a man, such problems as that of the absoluteness of Christianity may be to him a real question; but he who through the Spirit has learned of the great truth of redemption found in Christianity and in Christianity alone, for him such problems have only an academic interest as pathological symptoms of the diseased spiritual condition of a theologian.

IV. PROTESTANISM VERSUS ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN GERMANY.

There was a time, some decades ago, when an "era of good feeling" prevailed between the two great churches in the land of Luther, and each was content to abide by the *statu quo*. But this era is passed and it seems not improbable that Cardinal Weisman's prophecy is to prove true, who declared that the great apocalyptic battle between Cath-

olicism and Protestantism is "to be fought to the finish on the sands of Berlin." At any rate nowhere else is the tension between the two great branches of Christendom so marked and positive as is the case in Germany. Nowhere else are the conditions more favorable for a struggle between the two on an equal basis than is the case here. In Germany Roman Catholicism is at its best and at its worst. It is at its best because, through its contact and competition with Protestantism, it stands spiriually, intellectually, and socially higher than it does anywhere else. Many of the Catholic scholars in the universities of this "land of thinkers and authors" are real scholars, whose researches are marked by independence and thoroughness. Again the Church of Rome is at its worst in the Fatherland, because it makes use of these agencies of modern spiritual and intellectual welfare in the interests of an ultramontane type of churchism that is seemingly more Catholic than the Vatican itself. Luther already complained that Germany in his day was the most willing servant of the bishop of Rome. The same is true to-day, the few scholars, like Schell, or Würzburg; Erhardt, of Strassburg, and others demanding a more evangelical than the "political Catholicism" of the leaders, are drowned in the echo of the grand Catholic national convention, demanding the return of the Jesuits and the restoration of the eternal city to the Pope. The highest ideals of the Catholics of Germany are political and social and not religious or spiritual.

This agressive spirit has not been without a corresponding reaction in the Protestant circles. After an agitation of many years the Catholic Center party, the largest in the National and in the Prussian Parliaments, succeeded in having the second paragraph of the anti-Jesuit law, which forbade the activity of German Jesuits, recalled, and this declared to be only the first step to be followed by a revocation of the first paragraph, which would open the doors wide to Jesuits from without. The current idea that the Jesuits have actually been recalled is incorrect. The Center victory was more formal than real, but has aroused a furor evan-

gelicus throughout Germany, which found its expression in that the Evangelical Bund, or Association, founded some years ago, "to fight Rome with tongue and pen" has increased to a membership of more than one hundred thousand, chiefly from the educated ranks of the country. Nothing has contributed more than this to the perfection of a new "Federation of Protestant State Churches" throughout the Empire with headquarters in Dresden, to present henceforth an undivided front to the opposing forces of Roman Catholicism. This Federation is still new, fostered by the influential Eisenach Conference, and established at the special instigation of the Emperor.

It is remarkable how many ways and manners the Catholic minority find to attack and irriatate the Protestant majority. Recently they have attempted it through an especially bitter attack on the national and ecclesiastical hero, Martin Luther. The Catholic savant of good reputation, Denifle, sub-archivarius of the Vatican library, has written a life story of Luther, and by a singular, regularly Jesuitic perversion of the sources, mostly from the Reformer's own writings, has made him out the non plus ultra of wickedness and blackguardism, the toughest character in history. Denifle has followed the example of older Catholic historians, notably Janssen, who, about a dozen years ago, proved, by ways that are peculiar, from the original sources that the Reformation was the greatest misfortune that ever befel Germany. Denifle's perversion of history has called forth replies from leading Protestant scholars, among them Harnack, whose crushing expose of Denifle's superficial methods was met by the latter only with the word "liar."

The aggressive policy of the Catholics has, however, many weaknesses to contend with. Numerically, the Catholics constitute one-third of the populace of Germany, but the bulk of those forces and factors that make public thought and life, such as literature, education, the press, etc., are in the hands of the Protestants. The most of the universities are practically Protestant in their teaching corps and in the spirit that prevades professors and students. The Catholics

are notably weak in higher education and scholarship; their strength lies in their organization and in the skill with which the leaders know how to manage the masses at the polls and in public life. There is no danger of Germany's becoming Roman Catholic. Proportionately the Protestants are, numerically, too, holding their own, and in German-Austria the "Away from Rome" agitation has, in half a dozen years, brought thirty thousand Catholics into the evangelical fold. But the opposing principles represented by the two churches are in antagonism in the Fatherland as never since the thirty years' war, and in this respect Germany is making some interesting church history in our day and date.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE SCRIPTURES CONCERNING ORIGINAL SIN.*

BY REV. A. F. ROHR, A. M., SHIPPENVILLE, PA.

"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God," Ps. 14:1. In our day, the twentieth century, at the opening portals of which we still stand, and which, according to the self-constituted prophets, is to witness marvels and wonders, wrought by man, immeasurably beyond any heretofore known, the most prominent examples of such fools are the advocates of modern science, so called, who, deeply versed in the lore of this world, in spiritual blindness, ignore the Word of God, and arrogantly take upon themselves the office of teachers and leaders among mankind, and who, though generally known as scientists, call themselves Agnostics, while their positive teachings and operations, at least, so far as regards their special domain, proclaim them Gnostics, those who know. And woe to the unlucky wight who dares affirm that they do not know; for they will gibbet him—they will draw and quarter him, setting him before the world as an object of ridicule and persecution; while for him who believes and defends the teachings of the

* Published according to resolution of the Eastern District.

Scriptures over against their infidel operations, they have only scorn and derision, calling him an ignoramus, a back number, who, while science has been making its wonderful progress and discoveries, has been taking a Rip Van Winkle sleep on the mountains of antiquity, until his gun has rusted an fallen to pieces, his dog has died, his house has gone to decay, and his family has been scattered, and who has woke up to find himself wandering in a to him strange and unknown world, because of the mighty changes brought about by the scientific revolution which took place while he slept. To this notorious class of fools may well be applied the words of St. Paul when he says: "For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because that, when they knew God, they glorified *Him* not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves; who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator." Rom. 1:18-25.

This modern science, casting aside the Sacred Scriptures in utter scorn, accounts for everything along the lines of earthly wisdom and knowledge. It declares unto us in an unqualified-positive manner, the origin and nature of all things. In writings voluminous, it tells us the story of the earth's creation from an etherial and gaseous state, through periods of millions and millions of years to the present time, tracing the process of growth "through protoplasm, and

molecule, and mist, and star-dust, and rock, and mineral, and vegetable, to man; one growth, one organism, one development, all of a piece." From its point of view, it demonstrates to us, in a manner to put the whole matter beyond doubt, the descent of man through the lower forms of animal life. "Science teaches us that man is descended from the monkey," is a common expression. But science teaches us that the monkey, or rather, the ape is a comparatively recent ancestor of ours. There is only one stage between him and man, and that is found, or rather, yet to be found in the missing link. Science, in the bold flights of its imagination which it blindly mistakes for reason, goes away back beyond the monkey, or ape, and ages on ages, back beyond the time when our parental ancestor—to use the words of Samuel Wainwright—"was a jelly-bag. That jelly-bag sucking in water and sticking to a stone." This being—man—of such descent, science holds up before us as God, and represents him as saying, "before Jehovah was I am." On this point, Professor Clifford, for instance, says: "The dim and shadowy outlines of the superhuman deity fade slowly away from before us; and as the mist of his presence floats aside, we perceive with greater and greater clearness the shape of a yet grander and nobler figure—of him who made all gods and shall unmake them."

True, at present one wing of the scientific world is diligently searching for traces of an animal which one of their number calls an Oa; and when it is found, which will be, perhaps, in the near future, and perhaps not, it will completely reverse the present theory of evolution, and prove, of course beyond dispute, that the monkey has descended from man, in which case, man will most certainly have ample reason to be proud of his progeny.

But despite all its boastings—despite all its blatant and positive assertions, there is becoming more and more evident in the scientific world an undercurrent revealing on the part of its votaries a consiousness—though somewhat muddled—that something is wrong, and that perhaps after all their whole system is built on a foundation of sand. For in-

stance, Dr. Carpenter makes the following admission: "It is one of the difficulties which meet anyone who suggests that modern science is not wholly satisfactory, that it is immediately assumed that the writer is covertly defending what Ingersoll calls the 'reb-story,' or that he wishes to restore belief in the literal inspiration of the Bible. But religious controversy apart, and while admitting that science has done a great work in clearing away the kitchen-middens of superstition and opeuing the path to clearer and saner views of the world, it is possible—and there is already a growing feeling that way—that her positive contributions to our comprehension of the order of the universe have in late times been disappointing, and that even her methods are at fault and must lead to failure. After a glorious burst of perhaps fifty years, amid great acclamations and good hopes that the crafty old universe was going to be caught in her careful net, science, it must be confessed, now finds herself, in almost every direction, in the most hopeless quandaries; and whether the 'rib-story' be true or not, has at any rate provided no very satisfactory substitute for it." Again, an eminent scientist is reported to have spoken to an eminent churchman in England in substance as follows: "While we, in the field of science are making our investigations, we expect you of the church to hold the fort, for we may have to come back."

However, it is a sad fact, that despite their pernicious tendency to destroy all belief in the Word of God, not only many laymen, but also many, so called, ministers of the Gospel, to a great extent, at least, accept the rot and teachings of modern science as truth, and try to reconcile them with the Scriptures, rejecting the latter where they conflict, and preach and teach them to the people. The conclusions of modern science are incorporated into the textbooks of our public schools to be taught as established truths; from all indications, our public school teachers are almost unanimous in their acceptance of them; and the brightest and best of our pupils imbibe them to the undermining and destruction of their faith. The New Theology,

of which we have been hearing so much of late years, which would tear the Word of God to tatters and make havoc of what the true children of God have always held dearer than life, is a rank plant whose roots strike deep into the same soil out of which grows the poison exhaling up as tree of "modern science."

Of course, science does not, and in accord with its teachings cannot take account of sin as we understand it; in fact, while it unceasingly busies itself about the origin of everything else, it pays little, or rather, no attention at all to the origin of sin. What is destructive, harmful, and bad in man's nature it avers to be only a natural inheritance from his brute ancestors; but it fails to explain why the bad in man will lead him to excess and sink into depths which the brute never reaches.

But so much of this. For us these problems are solved. We who hold fast and are thankful for the inspired Word of God, the only sure source of knowledge regarding such matters, do not seek our ancestors in the oozy slime, filth, and dirt of primeval oceans, but in the Garden of Eden, where they are found as perfect human beings fresh from the hands of their Creator; and from thence, as a result of their folly, we, in the light of this Word, follow them and their posterity on a course of sin and shame through this world, yet bearing in their hearts the hope of reconciliation with their God, and restoration to Paradise when this life is done.

THESIS I.

Having reference to a great and valuable estate which our Heavenly Father committed to a representative of our family for administration.

The Scriptures teach us that God created man good—created him after His own likeness and in His own image, blessing him and givnig him dominion over all the earth.

On the eve of the sixth day, when the work of creation was finished, when the newly called-forth universe in perfection, beauty, harmony, and splendor passed in review

before the all-seeing of its Creator, we are told, "God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good." Gen. 1:31. The whole creation, every creature of His workmanship, was before Him; and in all, from the highest to the lowest and from the lowest to the highest, there was found nothing bad, nothing marred, nothing imperfect—nothing which did not perfectly satisfy the demands of His supreme will; therefore, He pronounced it all "very good."

Among the many creatures whom the Creator beheld and pronounced "very good," was also man, the most highly gifted being whom He had destined to dwell upon the earth, the one being into whose nostrils—Gen. 2:7—He had breathed the "breath of life, and man became a living soul." The fact that everything was "very good" is fully in accord with the teachings of Holy Writ, which represents God, the eternal, omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent, as absolutely perfect in each and every respect. In accord with the teachings of the Scriptures, He whose mind no one hath known, and whose counsellor no one hath been—Rom. 11:34—by virtue of His very nature and position, could not have created anything bad or imperfect; hence, as a creature of God, without reference to his grade and place in the scale of creation, man originally could not have been otherwise than good; or, again, God's will is supreme, He could create only in accord with His will; whatever is in accord with His will must be good before Him; and what is good before Him is and must be absolutely good, for there is no higher tribunal to pass or reverse judgment; hence, man having been created according to God's will, could not be otherwise than good; that is, pleasing and satisfying to the eye of his Creator.

Again, God did not only create man good along with all other creatures, but created him a being of a higher and different order from all others. Man was created "a living soul," a being consisting not only of mind (spirit) nor yet only of matter, but of a combination of the two, or rather, a connecting link between the two; as we read in Gen. 2:7;

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." In Gen. 1:26; we read: "And God said; Let us make man in our image, after our likeness:" and in Gen. 1:27: "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them:" and in Gen. 5:1; "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him:" and in Gen. 9:6; "For in the image of God made He man." This being whom God thus created was physically, spiritually, mentally, and morally a perfect being—a perfect man in every respect; and we in our present condition, with our sin-clouded minds, can have but a very faint conception, or should we not rather say no conception at all, of the glory and perfection of human nature as it came forth from the hand of God clothed with attributes divine, and as Lord of creation dwelling in purity, innocence, holiness, righteousness, and happiness in the Garden of Eden. That human nature in its perfection, as originally created, is of a very high order is distinctly taught us in the Holy Scriptures. The Psalmist, after having in awe considered the wonderful works of God as represented by the heavens—the sun, the moon, and the stars, turns to man, and, beholding him in his weakness, impotence, and frailty, exclaims: "What is man that Thou art mindful of him or the son of man that Thou visits him?" Ps. 8:4, but remembering what man should be and how he was created, he continues: "Thou madest him only a little lower than *Elohim.*" Psa. 8:5. True, this passage has been rendered—as for instance, in our English authorized version—"a little lower than the angels;" but at the present time, such rendering is deemed incorrect by the best and most competent authorities. In Luther's version it is translated: "Du wirst ihn lassen eine kleine Zeit von Gott verlassen sein." Geneius—Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch—after speaking of the use of the word *Elohim* as a numerical plural for Gods, remarks: "Ob dagegen die Alt Testamentliche Sprache *Elohim* auch für ἄγγελοι, Engel, brauche ist sehr fraglich obleich

die Bezeichmung dem israelitischen Gottesbewusstsein nicht ungemäss wäre." The following—see Preacher's Homiletic Commentary—are some of the present renderings regarded as the nearest approach to the original: "Thou madest him a little less than God"—*Wordsworth*: "Thou hast made him to want but little (or to come short but little) of God"—*Perowne*: "Thou hast made him a little less than divine"—*Delitzsch*: "And madest him to lack but little of God"—*Kay*. Gerlach—Bibelwerk—translates: "Und doch lässest ihm nur ein wenig fehlen an Gott;" and in his comments, after speaking of the use and signification of the word *Elohim*, adds: "Es wird also nicht gesagt, der Herr habe den Menschen nur ein wenig geringer gemacht, als sich selbst, was eine Vorstellung von Gott voraussetzte, wovon sich in der ganzen Schrift nichts findet; sodern an der göttlichen Herrlichkeit, an dem himmlischen Zustande der Wesen, die sets vor Gott stehen und ihn schauen, wie er ist, fehlt dem Menschen nur ein Geringes." But since the only object here is to show the exalted order of human nature in the scale of creation, the description of the manner and degree in which man "was made only a little lower than *Elohim*" does not come within the scope of this paper. But in the light of the foregoing, coupled with other testimony of Holy Writ, could we do otherwise than conclude that man, as a being made only a little lower, or a little less than God, or to lack but little of God, or made a little less than divine, in any sense of the word, could be other than a creature of a superlatively high order? True, while some regard the foregoing quotation from the eighth Psalm as having reference to the glory and excellency which the Creator gave unto man, others, basing their conclusion on reference found in the second chapter of Hebrews, regard it as Messianic, as having reference to Christ. But whether we take the one view or the other, that can make no difference as regards the contention for the very exalted order of human nature; for it is evidently to the assumption of the human nature by Christ that the writer of Hebrews refers. See Heb. 2:7-18; particularly, 9, 11, 14, 16, and 17. If the ex-

pression is permissible, Christ did not take upon Himself a superhuman human nature, or a nature of a different and higher order that that given to man, but real human nature, becoming, as we confess, true man even as He was true God. And when we interpret the declarations of te eighth Psalm in the light of other passages of Holy Writ, we find that they contain nothing that is not predicable of man as originally created, or as he will again be when restored to his high estate through Christ Jesus.

Besides, the exalted character of human nature in its perfection is also vividly brought before us by the fact that God, in His only begotten Son, took this nature upon Himself—"took upon Himself the form of man, and was made in the likeness of men"—and that He still retains, and will retain this naure to all eternity. While on earth, though without sin, the glory of the human nature in Christ was veiled by His humiliation for the sins of the world; but to-day, at the right hand of the Father is our brother man exalted not only as God but also as man, in honor and glory, Lord, Master—omnipotent Ruler over all things, for all things have been put under His feet—all things have been given unto Him of the Father; and the fact of His being man as well as God does not in the least lower Him from the right hand of the Father, or in the least detract from His power, honor and glory as God. So the very fact that, even though in Christ, God regarded human nature as fit for such supreme exaltation testifies louldy and eloquently for its very high order in the scale of being.

As regards the image of God and likeness to God: while the Scriptures do not in a certain number of words explain to us of just what it consisted, yet they do not leave us in the dark regarding the matter. Though it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss at length the nature of this image, and to examine in detail everything that did or did not constitute it, yet in order to learn and understand what man lost in the fall, it is only proper that we, at least aproximately, kow what he had to lose. In Col. 3:10, the Apostle Paul says, that the followers of Christ "have put

on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." In Eph. 4:24, we read: "And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Passages such as these show us that this image consisted in man's being endowed with certain moral and spiritual perfections and qualities, such as knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness. This image was not an essential part of man's nature; that is, these qualities did not constitute a part of man's substance or essence as a human being, but were accidents which, by special favor, the Creator bestowed upon him; therefore the loss of them could not and did not change the substance of his body and soul. After the fall, he was a human being still; and on the restoration of these attributes, here and in the world to come, he will still be a human being, essenially and substantially constituted as now. These gifts and attributes were not of a supernatural order, but were natural for the perfection of a being such as God created man in his original state. Quen. II, 9—quoted in Schmid's Dogmatics (Eng. by Hay and Jacobs)—thus defines the image of God: "The image of God is a natural perfection, consisting in an entire conformity with the wisdom, justice, immortality, and majesty of God, which was divinely created in the first man, in order that he might know, love, and glorify God, his Creator." Quoted in the same work, pp 242-243, we find, Cal. IV, 572: "Inasmuch as the conformity of man to God, as an archetype, is found to be manifold, and in respect to this conformity, the image of God is variously defined by different persons, the following rule should be particularly observed, lest we should here depart from the proper sense of the Scriptures: To regard as the image of God that conformity of man to God, which, having been impressed upon our first parents in creation, and having been almost entirely lost through the transgression, is to be restored by renovation in this life, and chiefly in blessed regeneration for the life to come." In the same work, p. 244, we find, Gerh. IV, 259: "The image of God consists in that in respect of which man was made like

God, and is renewed in the image of God; but he is renewed in respect of knowledge of God, righteousness, and holiness, etc., and in these particulars he is made like God, in the image of God. Therefore the primeval image of God in man consists of these things."

It is not with the image of God in every sense in which it is regarded and defined, but with this, called the accidental image, that we have to do when we consider the fall of man and its consequences. Hence this image of God, consisting of perfections and qualities with which the Creator blessed man, would comprehend in righteousness and true holiness such attributes as perfect knowledge and wisdom, Col. 3:9, 10; Gen. 2:19; Gen. 2:23; Gen. 2:24; freedom of will; absence of inordinate affection; Gen. 2:25 etc. See Schmids Dogmatics pp. 245-246.

As perfect and sinless beings, created good, and good indeed and in truth, it could not be otherwise than that the blessing of God should rest upon them in every respect—the blessing of a Father upon children whom He loved, and whose likeness to—whose being in perfect harmony and in union with Hlmself made them especially dear to Him; hence in Gen. 1:28, we read, that God blessed our first parents. And in the same verse, as regards the dominion and lordship which He bestowed upon them, we read: "And have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moeth upon the earth." See also Ps. 8:6-8. All this was in accord with His plan and resolution previous to the creation of man, as revealed by His saying, Gen. 1:26: "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness, and let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and oer all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."

Thus God made man a glorious being, the Lord of Creation, a perfect being, pure, righteous, innocent, and holy. He was a perfectly free being when placed by his Creator in the Garden of Eden, where, even though not upheld by supernatural grace, in the state of righteousness, had he not

outraged his nature, he and his posterity could have dwelt in happiness, peace, and unbroken favor with his Creator, and lived thus forever; for the Tree of Life, Gen. 3:22, was as another special mark of God's favor and goodwill, at hand to confer such immortality upon them. But alas! all this was changed.

THESIS II.

Having reference to the manner in which our representative, through mal-administration, ruined and lost this estate.

The Scriptures teach us that our first parents, tempted by the devil under the guise of a serpent, of their own free will, disobeyed the express command of their Creator, and by so doing, became the originators of that condition which we term the state of corruption or original sin.

When God created man, a creature of such exalted order, He also, "eastward in Eden," Gen. 2:8, by planting a beautiful garden, prepared for him a fitting home. In this garden, Gen. 2:9: "Out of the ground made the Lord to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil." "And the Lord took the man, and put him into the Garden of Eden to dress and keep it." Gen. 2:15. He placed man there, a good being, righteous and holy, knowing only good, and naturally inclined to do only that which is good, his perfections, qualities and virtues, if watched, being an ample protection against everything evil. Yet he was a free being; God had not bound him so that he could choose only the good, but had left him free to choose either good or evil—gave him liberty either to keep himself in subjection to his Creator's will, or to rebel against it. And it was here in the Garden of Eden that God laid His first command upon man, saying: "Of every tree in the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2:16,17. Not even the tree of life ex-

cepted, God forbade man nothing in the whole garden save only the tree of knowledge of good and evil; and besides, in language clear and distinct, gave him warning as to the result should he disobey. All things considered, this was a very light prohibition, and we can well conceive that it would require subtility of the highest order to lead man into disobedience. As regards this point, there are some, such as would make God the author of sin, who say, that the Creator made a mistake in granting man such freedom of will, that He ought, in this respect, to have made man so that he could have done nothing but that which is good, and been incapable of being tempted, and that He ought not to have planted the tree of knowledge of good and evil where man might be tempted to disobedience by it, etc., and because He did not do these things, therefore He Himself is really the athor of sin. But such seem to forget that, even though of a very high order, yet man was only a creature and subject of his Creator, and that as a creature he had all that was natural to him in its full perfection, and that, while clothed with god-like attributes, he, as a creature, did not and could not have God's prerogatives. The possession of these would have converted him from a creature into God. God, having given him in full measure all that rightfully belonged to him, was in no wise bound to give him anything more—anything more would have required the application of supernatural grace, something which the Creator does not owe to any man or any other creature. As to not being able to be tempted with evil, that is a prerogative belonging alone to God "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning," Jas. 1:7. Of Him only can it be predicated that "He cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man." Jas. 1:13. In a free and perfect being, incapability of being tempted with sin is a divine prerogative, the possessor of which must necessarily be Lord and ruler over all things; and His will must be the supreme law beyond which there can be no appeal. Thus man, as a free and perfect being, to have been created incapable of being tempted with sin, would have had to have been created equal

with God. For man to have been made incapable of sin by the application of supernatural grace would have taken from him his freedom of will and natural perfection; and if God had in this manner made man incapable of being tempted with sin, so doing would have been on His part an admission of weakness and imperfection in His handiwork. For Him to have done this would have been like adding a patch to cover some imperfection, defect, blemish, or weakness in a new machine the efficiency of which to serve its intended purpose has not been tested before the botching in its make-up has become apparent. But God's work as it comes from His perfect hand has no imperfections; no defects, no blemishes, no weaknesses. It needs no patching; and to argue that it does would, in accord with the universal law that like produces like, be to argue imperfection in the Creator Himself, in which case He would no longer be God, but only a subject of some still higher power representing the supreme standard of perfection. But as said, the Creator's work needs no patching; and so it was with man in his original state; he needed no patching of supernatural grace to sustain him in keeping the path of rectitude. He was made able and was able to stand alone.

But the happy and holy state in Eden underwent a great transformation. The law of Paradise, the one command which God had laid on our first parents, but which in substance represented the whole moral law, was transgressed; and the transgression was *their* sin. Contrary to positive order, they ate of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. This sin is called Adam's transgression, Rom. 5:14; likewise, "the offense of one," Rom. 5:15,17,18,; also, "one man's disobedience," Rom. 5:19. Both of our first parents transgressed the command, and the sin is ascribed to Adam alone merely by way of eminence. He was the beginning of the whole human race, of Eve whom God fashioned out of a portion of him, as well as all the rest of mankind; then he was also the head of the woman, Eph. 5:23; and besides, before God she was one with him, "bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh," Gen. 2:23.

At the foundation of the transgression, as its external and remote cause, was the devil, who of his own free will had before, by rebelling against the supreme will, fallen away from God, and, together with his followers, was cast out of Heaven, and who, as Christ declares unto us, is the father of lies and a liar from the beginning. This arch-transgressor, whose sin was so great that it plunged him and those who followed him utterly beyond all hope of redemption, led our first parents to their fall, and by so doing ruined our whole race, "not by internal impulse or by external violence (for each is repugnant to the integrity of that state in which man was originally created) but by mere external moral suasion." John 8:44; 2 Cor. 11:3; Rev. 12:9; Quen. II, 51; S. D. p. 258. In Gen. 3:1, we read: "Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord had made." And this serpent, which popular belief presumes to have been a snake, but the exact nature of which we do not know, though, no doubt, our first parents were very familiar with it, was the instrument through which the tempter addressed them. As to whether Satan really entered into a serpent, or merely assumed the form of one is with some a matter of dispute; but the curse, Gen. 3:14, would seem to indicate that a real serpent, no doubt, willingly consenting thereto, was used by the devil in the temptation of our first parents; for God would not, as He did, have cursed the beast itself if Satan had merely assumed its form without its consent. And that the devil was really under the guise of this serpent is shown by the curse, Gen. 3:15; also by Rev. 12:9.

But the internal and directly efficient cause of man's fall, as it is called, is to be found in man himself, in his intellect and will; not that these were in any way defective or imperfect, but because, in not being on his guard, man accidentally abused his liberty in the use of them. We must not as some do, imagine that man's heart was exposed to the temptation of Satan for the express purpose of bringing about his fall, for such was by no means the case. While the intention of the positive law was, no doubt, a trial or test

of the obedience which is due to God, yet to obey or to disobey was left altogether with man as a free moral agent; hence, under the circumstances, the transgression could be an act of man's free will only, without the consent of which Satan cannot even now in our corrupt state force any man to commit sin, and much less could he do so when he had no matter in Adam upon which to work. As man then was, with no internal impulse to sin, temptation could not come internally but only externally, as it did when the serpent speaking to Eve, said: "Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day that ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be gods, knowing good and evil." Gen. 3:4, 5. In this manner the case was presented by the tempter; and Eve, for the moment, as it were, gave him a hearing; and as the result which follows shows, listened attentively to the words of the seducer. Then, as she was perfectly free to do, using her powers of intellect, she, as it were, took up for consideration the matter as presented by the tempter. Here we should bear in mind that the serpent had not commanded her to eat, nor had he even directly asked her to do so; but he had simply denied what God had said, and in a cunning manner accused the Creator of jealousy in forbidding them the use of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and held out before her eyes the hope of becoming in wisdom like unto God Himself if they were to eat of the forbidden fruit.

When we speak of freedom of the will, we do not mean an absolute or independent freedom; that is, that the will acts, or under any condition, could act independent of the other powers of the mind, for such a freedom does not and never did exist. The action of the will is entirely dependent on the conclusions of the intellect as these affect the sensibilities, or medium through which the intellect influences the will. The will does not act without a motive; hence before it can act a motive must first be created, and the creation of such motive is the province or work of the creative or intellectual powers of the mind. Now Eve had a motive in what she did, and this motive came into existence through

the exercise of her intellectual powers. In the light of the Scriptures we can easily follow the creation of this motive to the act of willing to disobey the command of God not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Thus: as before said, the case was cunningly presented by the tempter for her consideration; and, as said, she did consider it, as we are told in Gen. 3:6, where we read: "And the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise." In this passage we can easily follow her line of reasoning as regards this matter. Naturally, the first question in her mind would be, "Is the tree good for food—is its fruit really fit to eat?" and her conclusion was, "She saw that the tree was good for food," one desirable quality; again, "Is there anything repulsive or dangerous in this tree and its fruit?" conclusion, "It was pleasant to the eyes," another desirable quality; again, "What will be the result of eating thereof?" conclusion, "It will make one wise—we will be like unto God Himself," a very desirable quality; final conclusion, "There is nothing whatever wrong about the tree or its fruit, and in accord with the words of the serpent, I am convinced that I will be only the wiser and better for eating of it." The motive was created, and her heart was filled with a strong desire for the fruit, and her will put forth volition in accord with the conclusions of her intellect. And as we are further told in Gen. 3:6; "She took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." As regards the particular sinful acts in the fall see S. D. p. 259. What course of reasoning Adam followed we are not told but it is certain that he did not eat against his will. "The woman was seduced by the serpent, but the man was seduced by the woman." 1 Tim. 2:13, 14. But such being the case did not mitigate Adam's sin. Therefore, when Adam said: "The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat," Gen. 3:12, God, admitting the source of his seduction, said: "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife," etc.; "Because thou hast hearkened unto

the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee not to eat," shows us wherein lay the very sin of Adam. He had the express command of God, and the light of it, together with the first principles of the law written in his heart, was in his understanding and judgment, ready, if he would follow them, to guide and keep him in the straight path despite all temptations. And it was not possible that, if he had had recourse to and had consulted these principles, he should have erred; or that he would have inclined to an act so expressly contrary to God's law, if he had continued fully to consider what was at hand ready to his view: for if he had used the light that he had in his first estate, error could not have befallen his understanding—to admit that it could would be to admit that God had created him not able to judge of what was good in every action —and his will could not have done otherwise than fixedly cleave to that which his understanding thought good. For the time being, his mind was not so taken up with seeing God face to face, his understanding was not so fully possessed with the sight of God and His will—was not so filled with the possession of Him, that he could not cast an eye about and consider whether there might not be some further good in store for him than that which he already had; and this, as it would seem, is the state in which the tempter found him. And when in this state the tempter suggested that there was further good in store for him, he turned aside from God. Thus the Scriptures express his sin by a not hearkening or attending to the light of the law, and the voice of it in his judgment, but "an hearkening to the voice of his wife."

By this one act, our first parents directly broke the positive command or law of God, indirectly the whole moral law, for as regards the fulfillment of God's will, which is the law, he that offends in one point is guilty of all, as we are told in Jas. 3:10. In this one act, though it seem insignificant to many people, time witnessed its greatest tragedy—the tragedy which is the fountain of all the sin, woe, and suffering of mankind in time and eternity, including the

humiliation and suffering of the only begotten Son of God for man's redemption.

Immediately on their having eaten of the forbidden fruit, a tremendous, and to them, no doubt, surprising change took place in our first parents. "The eyes of both were opened, and they saw they were naked." Gen. 2:7. Shame, the badge of guilt, had, as it were, been burned into their souls. "And they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons." Gen. 3:7. Their purity, innocence, righteousness, and holiness had departed—the image of God was gone. "In shame, they hid from the presence of God amongst the trees of the garden." Gen. 3:3. And when God called them, they found that with their shame was coupled another true indication of a guilty conscience; namely, fear, as is evident from the words of Adam when he said: "I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself." Gen. 3:10. In substance they were still the same human beings, but their condition was changed; and in them, as representatives of the human race, the condition of the whole human race; and this condition was and is that which we call the state of corruption of original sin.

Thesis III.

Having reference the manner in which our Heavenly Father justly punished the mal-administration of our representative.

The Scriptures teach us that the punishment for this sin was death spiritual, bodily, and eternal, that the earth was cursed for man's sake, and that he lost his dominion so that, instead of meeting him in submission, the creatures over which he was made to rule meet him in rebellion.

Through disobedience to God's command, in eating of the forbidden fruit, man became a criminal, and consequently subject to punishment, which is inseperable from guilt. This punishment was the wages of sin; and as we read in Rom. 6:23, "The wages of sin is death," which accords with God's

monitory words to our first parents: "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2:17. And it was even so; for with the transgression came death spiritual, bodily, and eternal to man. That God did not, as many people pretend to think and believe, means simply bodily death when He said, "Thou shalt surely die," is evident from the fact that our first parents did not die bodily immediately on their having partaken of the forbidden fruit. But they did die spiritually. When they, in disobedience, turned aside from their Creator, they broke the bond of union between themselves and Him; and this bond of union being broken, destroyed communion between them and their Maker; and the condition of non-communion with God is the condition of spiritual death. That such communion was destroyed is evident from the fact that after the expulsion from Eden, God no longer appeared to and communicated personally with our first parents as He had done before; and their having lost their god-like attributes of righteousness and true holiness estranged them from and brought them spiritually into disagreement with their God; and consequently there could no longer exist any spiritual communion between them and Him. Where before they had been spiritually minded, they had now become carnally minded; and as we read in Rom. 8:6, "To be carnally minded is death." Thus spiritually dead, bearing with them the remembrance of the happy days which were theirs in their innocence, and regret for the unspeakable loss which they had brought upon themselves, they were justly driven forth from Paradise, outcasts from God. The glorious earthly garden of Eden, with is beauties, pleasures and delights, was still in view, and no doubt, they often looked longingly towards those portals which divine justice forever closed and barred against them and theirs.

They were driven forth from Paradise not only spiritually dead, but also subject to bodily death. The Tree of Life, Gen. 2:9, which would have conferred earthly immortality upon them, had been planted in the garden, but for some reason or other, not because they were forbidden to do

so, they had not partaken of it; and a great blessing it was for them and us that they did not, for an immortality in the lost and sinful condition into which they dragged themselves and their posterity would be a subject two awful for contemplation. In order to prevent their attaining to such an immortality after their fall, God, in mercy, expelled them from Eden, and set a guard, Cherubims with a flaming sword, there to keep away from that tree, the partaking of which in the state of integrity would have been a blessing, but in the state of corruption would have been the greatest curse that could have befallen the human race. In the fallen state, such an immortality could have meant nothing less than eternal hell—everlasting banishment from God for all mankind; for with man in the possession of such an immortality, where would have been the work of redemption and reconciliation with the Father through Christ? In spite of its awfulness, in spite of its burden of woe and misery, in spite of its pangs and pains, in spite of its nakedness and desolation, in spite of its blackness, its gloom, its torture, and its abysmal depths of despair, would not man in his wickedness glory in the possession of such an immortality, and love it so dearly that there would be absolutely no hope of ever leading him to anything better? Yea, in that case he would be even as the devils, who stand in eternal opposition and defiance to God, and who, because of the utter hopelessness of their ever being led to redemption, were cast down to hell there to dwell in fire and chains forevermore. It was indeed an act of supreme mercy of which we read in Gen. 3:22-24: "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore, the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So He drove out the man; and He placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life." Thus being riven away and kept away from the tree of life consigned our first parents to bodily

death. And that such was to be their end bodily, was also announced to them by the Creator when He said: "Till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 3:19. And so it is, was, and shall be until the Book of Time is finished, sealed, and assinged its place in the annals of eternity.

Because of its being a state of non-communion with and banishment from God, spiritual death is already substantially eternal death; or at least, if its sovereignty is not broken, it will end in eternal death. This death, which is a perpetual exclusion from the enjoyment of God united with the torments of punishment for sin, and is a legitimate fruit of disobedience to the commands of God, would justly have been the inheritance of Adam and all his posterity had not Christ in His power, mightier than the power of sin, death, and hell, intervened and broken its covereignty, and enabled all who would, by the acceptance of grace to escape this death, so that henceforth, only those who persistently remain spiritually dead die eternally.

Again, as a punishment for having, through disobelience, wantonly cast away the glorious image of their Creator, came als sorrow, pain, and suffering of every stort to our first parents and to theirs. Their deed removed, as it were, the cover of an enormous pit, filled with poisonous exhalations, infernal odors, dread diseases, biting snakes, stinging scorpions, and torturing demons, all of which they loosed upon themselves to be compelled to have them continually present to contend with when, shorn of their strength, they would no longer be able to withstand the onslaughts of evil, but in their frailty and weakness, would go down wounded and overpowered by every dart which these powers of evil should launch against them. Unto Eve the Lord said, Gen. 3:16, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception, and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." And unto Adam He said: "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast

eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." Gen. 3:17, 18, 19. Thus we see that the curse of the sin of Adam, for Adam's sake, fell also upon the whole earth—the whole creation; hence, Rom. 8:20-22: "For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." For Adam's sake, in man himself, and on every hand in nature, are found decay, disibility, disharmony—a jarring and jangling—things running about one half as harmoniously as two cog wheels of which about one half of the cogs are missing.

And where is man's glorious dominion which, Gen. 1:28, and Ps. 8:6, 7, 8, God gave him? He was created lord of creation; he is now, and that only in a restricted sense, lord only over what he is able to subdue and keep under by force. He has not only become a slave of his own passions, appetites, and desires, and a trembling coward before the accusing finger of his guilty conscience, while at the same time a heart continually subject to fear beats in his bosom, and a servant of his fellowmen, but also a servant and a subject to the powers of nature. The earth rebels against his authority; and for all that he obtains from her, he must either, in the sweat of his brow, force her, or coax and pat her on the back; and then, as if in derision of his lordship, she frequently gives him only thorns and thistles in return. The wild beast destroys, and the adder stings; and the lion and the lamb do not lie down together. The beasts and the fowls and the creeping things whose meat, Gen. 1:30, was to be every green herb, destroy and devour one another, and also their former master; while man, besides in bloody carnage,

feud, etc., destroying his fellowmen, in turn, though his food, Gen. 1:29, also was to be herbs and fruits, kills and devours them; and in his wild state, as shown by the cannibalism of the past and present, also kills and devours his kind.

Such was and is the punishment which the sin of our first parents brought upon themselves and theirs. Such was and is the price which had to be paid divine justice for their not consulting the command of God, or suffering it to speak, or cleaving fixedly to the advice of the same, but instead permitting their understanding to wander in order to see whether perhaps there might not be something in what Satan suggested, until as a result of this wandering, there followed doubt as to the truth of what God had said, and jealousy that he kept them from eating of the tree out of envy lest they should become like Himself; and so hoping to better their condition in another way than by obeying God, and to be free from God's service, which, by God's law, if they would have happiness of Him, they were subject unto, they chose to set up for themselves, and so to be absolutely free from God. And thus thinking that they had found a new way to be happy beyond that which the Creator had given them, they fell into sin and misery. In Eccl. 7:29, we read: "God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions." Our first parents were the first of mankind to seek out inventions; and when they, at the suggestion of the tempter, sought out a new way to be happy, their first find was woe, misery, and death spiritual, bodily, and eternal. And ever since, restlessly and discontentedly walking to and fro in the earth, man is continually seeking new ways to be happy. But instead of being lord of creation as he was in Eden, he has become a beggar who cannot support himself, and who for such happiness and comfort as he may find is compelled to go to every creature.

THE SAVIOR'S NAMES AS RECORDED IN SCRIPTURES.

BY REV. JULIUS BOEHMER.

(*Translated from "Die Studierstube" by Rev. Paul D. Schillinger, A. B., Starr, Pa.*)

When we consider the names which our Saviour receives in Holy Scriptures we are not occupied with an idle question or child's play as would be the case if we were to count the words or letters of Holy Scripture, a task upon which recently one person spent all his free moments for nine years. Neither would we consider our undertaking a mere mechanical work as if names were not to the point; for this does not hold good here. In Holy Scriptures names, especially those of God and of the Saviour, express the essence or essential points. For the Christian it is indeed an attractive subject to consider what our Saviour is called in New Testament writings. Our subject is *names* and not figurative designations, attributes, epithets etc. The latter are considered only when they have become actual names or permanent surnames.

Sometimes it is indeed difficult to draw the line or to decide what is to be considered a name and what merely an equivalent of a certain name or an adjunct to a name. It may not appear correct to exclude all mere references or significations; but, unless this is done a line of demarcation would be impossible. Hence we shall not consider allusions or references even if they express the same as corresponding names (e. g. in Rom. 1:3. allusion is made to the designation "Son of David" expressed however in these words: "who was born of the seed of David"). Our rule shall be that all designations which independently denote the person of Christ shall be considered names of our Saviour in either the narrow or the wider sense. If any one does not consider that rule sufficient or correct, he, of course will consider our choice of names an arbitrary one. The appearance of arbitrariness is unavoidable.

The following are the names which the Saviour receives in the New Testament. We shall in considering this subject divide the writings of the New Testament into three groups. The Gospels are denoted by (a); the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse and the Catholic Epistles are denoted by (b); and the Pauline writings by (c):

		a	b	c	Total	
1.	Jesus	538	55	17	610	
2.	Christ	29	31	212	272	
3.	Jesus Christ	4	29	31	54	
4.	Christ Jesus	.....	4	82	86	
5.	Son of God	37	21	15	73	
6.	Son of God Jesus	.....	1	.....	1	
7.	Son of God Jesus Christ	.....	3	.....	3	107
8.	Jesus Christ Son of the Father	.....	1	.....	1	
9.	The Son	18	10	1	29	
10.	The Servant (Child) of God	1	3	.....	4	
11.	Holy One of God	3	1	.....	4	
12.	The Righteous One	.....	1	.....	1	
13.	The Son of Man	72	1	.....	73	
14.	Son of David	10	.....	.....	10	
15.	Son of Joseph	6	.....	.....	6	
16.	Son of Mary	1	.....	.....	1	
17.	Son of the Carpenter	1	.....	.....	1	
18.	The Nazarene	10	7	.....	17	
19.	The King	3	.....	.....	3	
20.	The King of Israel	2	.....	.....	2	
21.	The King of the Jews	17	.....	.....	17	25
22.	The King of Zion	1	.....	.....	1	
23.	The King of Kings	.....	2	.....	2	
24.	Rabbi[1]	4	.....	.....	4	
25.	Rabboni[1]	2	.....	.....	2	40
26.	Teacher[1]	28	.....	.....	28	
27.	Master[1]	6	.....	.....	6	
28.	The Prophet	22	3	.....	25	
29.	Highpriest	.....	10	.....	10	
30.	Shepherd (Pastor)	.....	2	.....	2	
31.	Chief Shepherd[2]	.....	1	.....	1	
32.	Bishop	.....	1	.....	1	
33.	Witness	.....	2	.....	2	
34.	Apostle	.....	1	.....	1	
35.	Author (Prince, Captain)	.....	4	.....	4	
36.	Perfecter	.....	1	.....	1	
37.	Mediator	.....	2	1	3	
38.	Minister (*λειτουργός*)	.....	1	.....	2	
39.	Minister (*διάκονος*)	.....	.....	1	2	
40.	Paraclete (Comforter, Advocate)	1	1	.....	2	

		a	b	c	Total
41.	Brother	(9)	(3)	(1)	(13)
42.	Friend	(5)	.....	.....	(5)
43.	Lamb	.....	23	.....	23
44.	Lord	33	10	150	193
45.	Lord Jesus	.....	15	17	32
46.	Lord Christ	.....	.....	1	1
47.	Lord Jesus Christ	.....	2	20	22
48.	Our Lord	.....	1	3	4
49.	My Lord	1	.....	.....	1
50.	Our Lord Jesus	.....	1	10	11
51.	Our Lord Christ	.....	.....	1	1
52.	Our Lord Jesus Christ	.....	10	36	46
53.	Our Lord Christ Jesus	.....	1	4	5
54.	My Lord Christ Jesus	.....	.....	1	1
55.	Master (δεσπότης)	.....	1	1	2
56.	Our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ	.....	1	.....	1
57.	Saviour	2	1	.....	3
58.	Our Saviour Jesus Christ	.....	.....	1	1
59.	Our Saviour Christ Jesus	.....	.....	1	1
60.	The Lord and Saviour	.....	1	.....	1
61.	The Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ	.....	1	.....	1
62.	Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ	.....	1	.....	1
63.	God	1	2	1	4
64.	Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ	.....	1	.....	1
65.	Our great God and Saviour	.....	.....	1	1
	Total ca.	.....	.....	.....	1,700

Of these sixty five names found in the New Testament according to the Greek text of Nestle the simple name "Jesus," which is used to denote His person, occurs most frequently namely 610 times out of the 1700 passages which contain names of the Saviour or more than one-third. Second in order, the name which denotes His Office, "Christ," is found 272 times or in about one-sixth of the passages. Thirdly, "Lord" occurs 193 times or in about one-ninth of the passages. These three designations—"Jesus," "Christ," "Lord," are found in 1075 passages or in two-thirds of all

the passages considered. Only one-third therefore remains for the other 62 designations.

It is noteworthy also that in the Gospels the name "Jesus" occurs 538 times and in the remaining books only 72 times, that the name "Christ" is found 212 times in the Pauline writings and in the others only 60 times, and that "Lord" is found in Paul's Epistles 150 times and in the others 43 times. As one would expect, the name "Jesus" is found most frequently in the historical writings concerning Jesus and the designations "Christ" and "Lord" occur more frequently in the writings written more for edification or confessional purposes and that in the latter, names of an historical character are found less frequently. A further comparison confirms this truth.

Of the other sixty-two designations only a few occur often. "Christ Jesus" is found 86 times; "Son of God" and "Son of Man" each 73 times (a noteworthy coincidence); "Jesus Christ" 54; "Our Lord Jesus Christ" 46; "Teacher" 40; "Lord Jesus" 32; "Son" 29; "Prophet" 25; "Lamb" 23; "Lord Jesus Christ" 22; "The King of the Jews" and the "Nazarene" each 17; "Our Lord Jesus" 11; "Son of David" and "High Priest" each 10; "Son of Joseph" 6; "Our Lord Christ Jesus" 5; "Our Lord," "The Holy One of God," "Prince," and "God" each 4; "King" and "Mediator" each ; "Saviour," "King of Israel," "King of Kings," "Master," (δεσπότης), "Shepherd," and "Witness" each twice; the remaining 18 designations: "Son of God Jesus," "Son of God Jesus Christ," "Jesus Christ Son of the Father," "The Righteous One," "Son of Mary," "Son of the Carpenter," "King of Zion," "Chief Shepherd," "Bishop," "Apostle," "Minister," (λειτουργός), "Minister" (διάκονος), "Lord Christ," "My Lord," "My Lord Christ," "My Lord Christ Jesus," "Our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ," "Our Saviour Jesus Christ," "Our Saviour," "Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," "Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ," and "Our great God and Saviour," each once.

A collection of the most important names of our Saviour alone and in composition exhibits the following:

"Lord" 193, "Our Lord" 4, "My Lord" once, "Lord Jesus" 32, "Lord Christ" 1, "Lord Jesus Christ" 22, "Our Lord Jesus" 11, "Our Lord Christ" 1, "Our Lord Jesus Christ" 46, "Our Lord Christ Jesus" 5, "My Lord Christ Jesus" once, the total number of times that "Lord" appears is 318.

"Master" occurs twice and "Our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ" once, "Saviour" 3, "Our Saviour Jesus Christ" 1, "Our Saviour Christ Jesus" 1, "Lord and Saviour" 1, "Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" 1, "Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" 1, "Our great God and Saviour" 1, "Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" 1. The total number of times that "Saviour" appears alone and in composition is ten. "God" appears four times alone and in composition twice, total six times.

(1.) If we consider the three names which occur most frequently as they appear in composition the following is discovered: "Jesus Christ" is found 54 times; "Christ Jesus," 86; "Lord Jesus," 32 etc. (vid. supra.) Total 259 times; added to the 1075 passages in which "Jesus" and "Christ" occur, makes a sum total of 1334 times or more than seven-nineths of the 1700 passages enumerated.

(2.) "Son of God" and "Son of Man" each appear 73 times; "Son of Man" was used by Jesus alone except once in Acts (7:5) probably, however, an allusion to the works of Jesus (Mark 14:62). Paul shows that he was acquainted with this term in Rom. 5:15 and 1 Cor. 15:45. It was not used, however, in the early Church. On the other hand the term, "Son of God," occurs in the Gospels 37 times, in the Pauline writings 15 times, and in the remaining books 21 times and must therefore have been used generally by early Christians.

(3.) Of the forty passages which designate Jesus as "Teacher," 4 use the word "Rabbi," 2 "Rabboni," 28 "Teacher" and 6 "Master." All are found in the Gospels. "Rabbi" and "Rabboni" are the Hebrew for "Teacher of the

Law," "Master" is used by Luke alone and in only six passages. The word "Teacher" as used in all these passages has the specific Jewish signification, "Teacher of the Law" or "Scribe" and contrasts Jesus with the Scribes designating him as the genuine true Teacher, sent of God (Jno. 3:2), One who "taught them, as one having authority, and not as their scribes." (Matt. 7:29). As a Jewish term of distinction it was no more used after the ascension of Jesus.

(4.) The *name* "Lamb" is used 23 times and only in the Apocalypse; it, however, occurs in parallel passages, citing the Old Testament, but is not used as a name in these (Jno. 1:29; cf. Isa. 53.)

(5.) Jesus is called "King" 25 times, in the Gospels 23, and in the Apocalypse twice, generally in the Jewish messianic signification. Allusions to this name are found in other passages, e. g. 1 Cor. 15:24. It occurs 20 times in composition ("King of the Jews" 17, "King of Israel" 2, "King of Zion" once) and in the same sense three times alone. Only in the account of the Judgment day (Matt. 25: 46 sqq,) and in two passages in the Apocalypse, where "King of Kings" is used, does it designate His omnipotence and rule over the world as King of Power and Glory and not as King of Grace specifically.

(6.) It is a question whether "The Righteous One" is to be considered a name or not; but the literature of the Church uses it as such. An Advent hymn uses the term thus: „Zions König, der Gerechte, kommt in der Gestalt der Knechte" and a lenten hymn „Die Schuld bezahl der Herre, der Gerechte, für seine Knechte"

The preceding term "The Holy One" (Acts 3:14) seems to support this view. "The Holy One" is doubtless an abreviation for "The Holy One of God," occuring three times in the Gospels, and is used in the same sense as the One consecrated unto God or belonging to God, about the same as the Anointed of God, Messiah, Son of God. Coordinate with this term is "The Righteous One" which designates the Saviour as the genuine Israel, the most pious of the Pious, the One in whom God is entirely pleased, and is

therefore a distinctively religious term and not specifically of ethical signification.

(7.) Jesus is called "Prophet" in the Gospels 22 times (Matt. 4 times, Mark 2, Luke and Jno. each 8 times) and in Acts three times in citations from the Old Testament. His divine office of teaching is denoted by this term; whereas "Teacher" or "Rabbi" denotes His office of teacher as a human institution and shows the honor which was accorded Him among the Jews. This term, "Prophet" is applied only to His oral preaching during the state of humiliation. In His state of exaltation He is never spoken of as "Prophet."

(8.) Jesus is called High Priest ten times and only in Hebrews (nine times Chief Priest and once Great Priest.) This name is applied to Him as the one who died on the cross and includes all the heavenly results which were accomplished by that death. When Christ died upon the cross He accomplished the task imposed upon Him by His heavenly high priestly office and is therefore called "High Priest." That is all that the term "High Priest" as used in Hebrews wishes to express. He is also called "Priest" once in Hebrews rfrring to Psalm 110, but "High Priest" is substituted for Priest in the interpretation of the citation.

(9.) Jesus is called "God" six times, four times "God" alone (once in the Gospels, once in Paul's Epistles and twice in the other books). In Titus, He is called "Our great God and Savious" and in Jude "Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ." In every passage in which He is called "God" the context must be carefully observed and is noteworthy. In the first place, this term is everywhere applied to the risen or exalted one. In Jno. 20:28 the term is modified by "my" and "my Lord." In Hebrews 1, it is used twice in a citation from a Psalm. It is a disputed point whether the term in Rom. 9:5 refers to Jesus or not. In 2 Peter 1:1 and Titus 2:13 the term is also interpreted by the addition of "Our" and "Saviour." The context everywhere shows that the term is clearly applied to Jesus.

(10.) Jesus is called "Saviour" ten times; but the term is never used alone. There are nine expressions in

which this term is used as follows: "Saviour Christ the Lord" (Luke 2:11), "Saviour of the World" (Jno. 4:42, 1 Jno. 4:14), "Our Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Tim. 1:10), "Our Saviour Christ Jesus" (Tit. 1:4), "The Lord and Saviour" (2 Pet. 3:2), "Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 2:20), "Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 3:18), "Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 1:1), "Our Great God and Saviour" (Tit. 2:13).

(11.) It is interesting to observe the ecclesiastical offices and honors which the Saviour receives in various names. He is called, "Apostle," "Bishop," "Chief Shepherd," "Shepherd," (Pastor), "Minister" (λειτουργός), "Minister" (διάκονος, deacon), "Witness" (μάρτυς, martyr). He is called "Apostle" once, (Heb. 3:1), as the one sent from God above all others, the greatest of God's Messengers, "Bishop" (Overseer, Guardian) He is called once in 1 Pet. 2:25 (Overseer or Guardian of the Christians' souls). He is also called "Chief Shepherd" once in 1 Pet. 5:4 to show that He is the heavenly Pastor who is placed over all things earthly and from whom all earthly things receive the norm, power and aim of their effectiveness. Jesus is called "Shepherd" (Pastor) twice, namely in 1 Pet. 2:25 and Heb. 13:20; and in the parable of the Good Shepherd (Jno. 10, 11, 14.) He compares himself with a shepherd. Both terms, "Chief Shepherd" and "Shepherd" express the idea that He cares for the welfare of their souls and for their eternal salvation. He is called not only Pastor but also "Minister" (λειτουργός) because He serves at the altar of the heavenly sanctuary (Heb. 8:2). This term refers to the same work which Jesus performed as High Priest so frequently mentioned in Hebrews. It denotes a free person (not a slave) in the public service and here especially one who performs the work commanded by God for the salvation of all men. Another name for Jesus (διάκονος) is also rendered "Minister." It occurs only once in Rom. 15:8. He is called "A Minister of the circumcision" i. e. of the chosen people of Israel, the one who appeared a Saviour first unto the Israelites and during His ministry upon earth confined His labors

to that people. The sense of the word "minister" as derived from such passages as Mark 10:45, Luke 22:27 ("as he that serveth" Jno. 1)3:1sqq., is that He gave Himself, body and sould, life and love for Israel's service, for its salation. Twice Jesus is called "Witness" (martyr) namely in theApocalypse 1:5, ("the faithful witness"); 3:14 ("the faithful and true witness"); He bears witness concerning God according to the truth, what He is, has done, does and will do, therefore He is God's witness (cf. Jno. 3:11) and bears witness through His preaching and daily walk, through His essence and entire person.

(12.) Jesus is called "Meditator" three times, only once, however, in the sense in which we are accustomed to use the word (1 Tim. 2:5) that He is mediator between God and man, who has established peace between God and man through His work of redemption. In the other two passages, He is spoken of as a meditator of a covenant. Hebrews 8:6 speaks of Him as the "Meditator of a better covenant" and 9:15 as "Meditator of a new covenant," mediator here signifies surety. Jesus mediates or guarantees to man in the name of God a better, a new covenant; He fulfills the promise of a perfect salvation given by God in the Old Testament.

(13.) "Äuthor" (Prince, Captain) Jesus is named four times. The Greek word ἀρχηγός signifies the one who leads, goes ahead, therefore the Prince, the Author. It is found twice in Acts and twice in Hebrews. Without any addition in Acts (5:31) in the sense of Lord (Luther: "Fürst") and then 3:15 "Author (Prince, Luther: Fürst") of life" (of eternal life). In Hebrews 2:10 "Author (Captain, Luther: 'Herzog, of their salvation" and 12:2 "Author (Captain, Luther: 'Anfänger') of our faith." (In the same passage corresponding to this term is found "Perfecter of our faith.")

(14.) Twice Jesus is called "Paraclete," alluded to in Jno. 14:16 ("another comforter") and expressly in 1 Jno. 2:1. (Luther: "Fürsprecher.")

Finally it must not be passed by unnoticed that the name "Brother" and "Friend" are never applied to Jesus in the New Testament, notwithstanding that churchly usage seeks support from the Bible for applying these terms to Jesus. The New Testament does indeed speak of the brothers of Jesus and Jesus Himself calls those "His brethren" who remain in His union of love and essence. Thus Jesus speaks in Matt. 12:48-50; 25:40; 28:10; Mark 3:34sq; Luke 8:21; Jno. 20:17; thus Rom. 8:29 and Heb. 2:11,12,17 testify. But He never called himself "Brother" nor was He ever addressed or spoken of as such. Thus He sometimes called His Disciples "Friends," but was never called "Friend" Himself. The passages Matt. 11:19 and Luke 7:34 do not speak of His name as Friend but of a judgment of evil men concerning Him. On this account we do not consider "Brother" and "Friend" as really names of Jesus and therefore have enclosed the number of times that such allusions occur, in parantheses in the table.

Let us consider the different groups of New Testament writings with regard to the names of the Saviour. First, the Gospels.

We have seen that in the Gospels the name "Jesus," which occurs here 538 times, predominates. In the second place "Son of man" is found 72 times; and then follows "Teacher" 40 times; "Son of God" 37; "Christ" 29; "King" 25; "Prophet" 22; "Son" 18; "Son of David" and "Nazarene" each 10, and all the other names less frequently. Taking each Gospel separately, "Jesus" is found most frequently in John, namely 228 times, and then follows Matthew 151, Luke 86, and Mark 73 times. On the other hand "Christ" is found in Matthew and Luke each ten times. Sometimes the term is also found as an appellative, or on the dividing line between appellative and name, especially, in Luke and John, (e. g. "The Christ of God," Luke 9:20; "The Christ the Lord" 2:26; "The Christ" 4:41). "Jesus Christ" is found in Matthew twice and in Mark and John each once, and not at all in Luke. The Pauline writer Luke, uses "Lord" more

frequently than the other Evangelists, namely 18 times, John uses it 11; Matthew 3; and Mark two times. Of course we speak of "Lord" only as applied to the Messiah. Therefore when Jesus is addressed as "Lord" as any other man would be addressed as "Lord," or when the term is used to denote God it cannot be considered a name of Jesus and is not enumerated as such, (e. g. John 12:21; 20:13, 15; Mark 13:20; Luke 1 frequently). Only when the context shows that it is used as a distinctive designation of the Messiah is it enumerated (e. g. Matt. 7:21, Luke 1:43, but not Matt 8:2, 6, 8, 21, 25.) "Son of Man" occurs in Luke 25 times, in Matthew 20, in Mark 14, and in John 13 times. Matthew has "Son of David" six times, Mark and Luke each twice, and John not at all. Matthew calls Jesus "King" seven times, John also 7, Mark 5 and Luke 4 times. He is called "God" in Matthew 12 times, Luke 9 (Luke calls him "Son of the Highest" and "the Chosen Son" each once), Mark and John each six times. John also calls him the "Only begotten Son of God" four times. He is also called "The Son" in Matthew four times, Mark once, and John 13 times. Jesus is designated "Teacher" in Luke 17 times (11 times the ordinary word "Teacher" and six times "Master" is used,) Matthew and Mark each seven times and John three times. Mark uses "Rabbi" and "Rabboni" each once and John uses "Rabbi" once and "Rabboni" three times. Matthew calls Jesus "The Prophet" four times, Mark twice, and Luke and John each 8 times. "The Holy One of God" is found once in each one of the Gospels of Mark, Luke and John. "Son of Mary" is used once in Mark, "Son of Joseph" once in Luke and five times in John. "Savious" is used by Luke and by John each once. "God" is found in the words of Thomas recorded by John. The name "Lord" is not found in the Gospels connected with "Jesus" or "Christ" or both.

Let us now consider Paul's use of these terms. Under Pauline writings we include all from Romans to the pastoral epistles inclusive. The use of the name "Christ" is characteristic of this group, being used 317 times, 212 times alone,

83 times with "Jesus" following, 22 times with "Jesus" preceding, not considering their combination with the name "Lord." It is combined with "Lord 63 times, making a total of 378 times that Paul uses "Christ." In frequency of use "Lord" occupies the second place. The other names are used rarely. "Jesus" alone is found 17 times, "Son of God" 15 times, "Son" and "Master" (δεσπότης) each once, "Saviour" once with "Jesus Christ" and once with "Christ Jesus," "God" once, and "Our great God and Saviour" once. "Lord" is used 150 times. The solemn and festive designation, "Our Lord Jesus Christ" is found 36 times, "The Lord Jesus Christ" 20 times, "Lord Jesus" 17 times, "Our Lord Jesus" ten times, "Our Lord Christ" four times, "Our Lord" three times, "Lord Christ," "Our Lord Christ," "My Lord Christ Jesus" each once.

It is instructive to consider the usage in the earlier and later epistles. In Thessalonians "Lord" is found 46 times; ten other times ("Jesus," "Christ," "Christ Jesus," "Son of God") the Saviour is named. In Romans "Christ" is found 50 times, 29 times alone and 21 times in composition, "Lord" is used 25 times; "Minister" (διάκονος) is found once here. In 1 Corinthians we find "Christ" 50 times and "Lord" 57 times. In 2 Corinthians "Christ" occurs 44 times and "Lord" 27 times. "Jesus" is found only six times in 2 Corinthians and only twice or perhaps three times in 1 corinthians and Romans together. In Galatians we find "Christ" 36 times, "Lord" five times, "Son of God" four times and "Jesus" once. In Ephesians "Christ" is found 40 times, "Lord" 24, "Son of God" and "Jesus" each once; in Philippians "Christ" 32, "Lord" 19, "Jesus" once; in Colossians "Christ" 26, "Lord" 15, "Son of God" once. In the epistles just mentioned the simple "Christ" is used more frequently than combined with "Jesus," especially in the four principal epistles and the "captivity" epistles; but in the pastoral epistles "Christ Jesus" is found more frequently, in 1 and 2 Timothy 10 times and "Jesus Christ" in each once; "Christ" is found only once in these epistles; "Lord"

is used four times in the first and 14 times in the second, "Meditator" is found once in the first. In the first therefore "Christ" has the preference, and in the second "Lord." Titus uses "Jesus Christ" once, "Our Saviour Jesus Christ" once, "Our Saviour Christ Jesus" once, 2 Timothy also has "Our Saviour Christ Jesus" once and "Master" (δεσπότης) once. Philemon notwithstanding its brevity is characteristically Pauline in this respect. It uses "Christ" 3 times, "Christ Jesus" 3 times and "Lord" 6 times.

In the other New Testament writings the problem is more complex than in the Gospels and Paul's writings. They form no unity and are all very brief except Acts, Hebrews and the Apacolypse, so that it is hard to establish any rules concerning their use of these terms. Acts uses "Christ" 7 times, twice with the addition "God," and "Jesus Christ" 10 times; "Lord" is found 30 times, "Lord Jesus" 13 times, "Lord Jesus Christ" once, "Christ Jesus" (specifically Pauline) four times, "Our Lord Jesus Christ" twice. In this respect it shows Pauline influence, "Jesus" is found 32 times, "The Nazarene" 7 times, "Prince" (Author) twice, "Son of God" and "Son of Man" each once. Thus the historical character is shown as it is in the Gospels. Here only the designations "The Holy One" and "The Righteous One" are found, "The Servant of God" (παίς) is found three times (cf. 40, sqq.).

Hebrews is also pecliar in its se of these terms. It uses "Jesus" 9 times, "Christ" 9, and "Jesus Christ" 9; but not once does it use the specific Paluine "Christ Jesus." "Lord" is used 5 times, three times alone, once with "Jesus" and once "Our Lord," a characteristic of the Gospels rather than of Paul, as is also the use of "Son of God" six times and "Son" three times. Jesus is also called "God" twice, as often as in the Gospels and Paul together. Peculiar to Hebrews is the use of "High Priest" ten times, "Apostle" once, "Minister" (λειτουργός) once, "Mediator of the covenant" twice. As in Acts, "Prince" (Author) is used twice and "Shepherd," as in 1 Peter, is used once. In this re-

spect Hebrews is not Pauline neither has it the striking peculiarities of the Gospels.

The Apocalypse must also be treated alone. It uses "Jesus" 9 times, "Christ" 7, "Lord" 5, (including "their Lord" twice and "Lord of Lords" twice), "The Lord Jesus" twice, "Christ Jesus Our Lord" once. Peculiar also to the Apocalypse is "King of kings" and "Witness," both found twice and "Lamb" found 23 times.

Of the Catholic Epistles James offers us the least, "Lord" is used twice, "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory" once. 1 Peter uses "Christ" 13 times, "Jesus Christ" 8 times, "Our Lord Jesus Christ" once and approaches the Pauline usage more than that of the Gospels, although "Lord" is used rarely, "Shepherd" is used once, "Chief Shepherd" and "Bishop" each once. 2 Peter and Jude which in vocabulary and other respects are similar exhibit a diversity in the use of the terms for our Saviour; 2 Peter uses "Jesus Christ" once, "Our Lord Jesus Christ" four times, "Son of God" once, "Master" (δεσπότης) once, "Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" once, "Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" and "Our Lord and Saviour" each once. Jude uses "Jesus Christ" twice, "Our Lord Jesus Christ" twice, "Our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ" once.

It remains to consider the Epistles of John. The third does not use any designation for Jesus. The first and second in general agree. The first uses "Jesus" five times, the second not at all; the first uses "Christ" once, the second once, the first uses "Jesus Christ" four times, the second once; the first uses "Son" six times, the second once; the first uses "Son of God" 12 times, (once with the addition "Only begotten") the second not at all, the second uses "Jesus Christ Son of the Father" once. 1 John speaks once of "the Saviour of the World" (the Gospel also uses "Saviour" once), once of "the Son of God Jesus Christ" and once of "Jesus the Son of God" (both terms peculiar to this epistle).

Summary:—

The three usual names are "Jesus," "Christ," "Lord." "Jesus" is found 610 times alone and 265 times in composition, total 875 times. "Christ" is found 272 times alone and 223 in composition, total 495 times; "Lord" is found 193 times alone and 127 times in composition, total 320 times. In order of frequency "Son of God" is next, generally alone, once with the addition "Jesus" (1 Jno. 1:7), with "Jesus Christ" three times (1 Jno. 1:3; 3:23; 5:20), and in the construction "Jesus Christ, Son of the Father" once (2 Jno. 3), "Son" alone 29 times, total 107 times.

"Jesus" and "Son of God" predominate in the Gospels, Acts, Hebrews, the Apocalypse and Catholic epistles; "Christ" and "Lord" are distinctively Pauline.

THE CHRISTIAN IN TEMPTATION.

Preached before Lima Conference by Rev. Fred W. Rohlfing, Carrollton, Ohio.

As music is sweetest near or over streams and rivers where the echo is best rebounded by the waters, so praise for sadness, thanks for tears and magnifying God over the waters of affliction make the most melodious music in the ears of Heaven. As God is pleased with the music of song over the waters of sighing and sorrowing, so He is displeased with the inharmonious sounds of murmuring, muttering and discontentment. A religion that will not bear temptation is no religion. A religion that remains the same, whether God smile or frown on surrounding circumstances is true religion. No matter how staunch and firm the Christian may be in religious faith and life, he will be tried with many and various temptations. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

The Christian in temptation occupies a threefold position: First, Looking backward; second, Looking about him; third, Looking forward. Looking backward into the

sacred history of the Scriptures, the Christian in temptation, beholds God's primitive people, the Jews, passing through many trials from the Land of Oppression to the Land of Promise. They were all under a cloud. God's own Shekinah, now assuming the hue of blackness to conceal them from their enemies, now spreading out over them like a mighty sheet to protect them against the heat of the desert, and again blazing forth in mystic splendor, a lamp unto their feet and a light unto their paths. With many of them, however, God was not well pleased. For although they were all baptized unto Moses, and did all eat of the same spiritual meat—the manna that fell from heaven, and did all drink of the same spiritual drink—the waters that gushed from the rock; yet they were overthrown in the wilderness. "He lifted up His hand against them and overthrew them in the wilderness." Coveting the flesh of Egypt, which God withheld; indulging in idolatry, eating, drinking and revelling as surrounding heathen nations; committing fornication invariably connected with Pagan festivals and services; murmuring against Moses and Aaron, the divinely appointed servants of Jehovah; desiring to turn back to the Land of Oppression, instead of going on to the Land of Promise, many of them perished in the wilderness. "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself." Visited by a terrible plague, 23,000 of them perished in a single day; the wrath of the Lord being provoked, the earth opened, swallowing up Korah and all his company; fiery serpents, pursuing them wherever they went, caused many of them to die; finally, most terrible of all, the same angel of death that visited the rebellious Egyptian homes and smote their first-born sons came to the murmuring Israelites too and many of them were destroyed. "The wrath of the Lord was enkindled against His people, insomuch that He despised His own inheritance."

Looking backward into the sacred history of the primitive Church, the Christian in temptation sees the early martyrs passing through much tribulation into the Kingdom of Heaven. Through the instrumentality of cold-hearted

monarchs, cruel kings and blood-thirsty tyrants persecution after persecution was instigated against them. To conduct divine services, to administer the Sacraments, to worship God in spirit and in truth, they must flee from catacomb to catacomb. Scarcely had Christ died on the cross to atone for the sins of the world; scarcely had He burst the silent tomb and illumined the world with His heavenly light; scarcely had He in His own majesty and by His own power ascended to the throne of Infinite Glory, when hundreds upon hundreds of Christian people were thrown to voracious beasts on public arena at Pagan Rome. A hundred thousand Pagans raised a shout of applause; but louder and louder still rang the acclaim of clustering angels, gathering around the Christians, welcoming them home, and bearing their souls to heaven.

Looking backward into the imperfect character of his own life, the Christian in temptation sees many a burdened conscience pardoned, many a distracting thought removed, many a sorrow soothed, many an affliction taken away by the means of Grace, the Word and Sacrements. For the faith enkindled in the washing of regeneration, the gracious water of life, the renewing of the Holy Spirit; the faith wrought by the proclamation of the Gospel, the glad tidings, the power of God unto salvation, the faith confirmed in the Holy Eucharist in which he has forgiveness of sins, life and eternal salvation, is the victory that overcomes the world. Faith that begins the conflict with the evil, naturally existing in the heart of every man, faith that appropriates the righteousness of Christ, covering all his sins and imperfections and shortcomings, faith that sustains him in this oftentimes severe and very doubtful conflict, will ultimately give the triumph. It is faith that touches love and causes it to flame forth, winning others by its constant genial light; it is faith that feeds hope and makes it strong; it is faith that smiles upon joy, courage and zeal crowning them with invincibility.

Looking about in the light of the above examples, the Christian in temptation realizes that while he has been baptized into Christ, and is strengthened with spiritual meat,

and is sustained with spiritual drink; yet he may at any time yield to temptation and fall from grace. True, he has spiritual power with which to resist and overcome temptation, and this spiritual power is the grace of God. The Jews of old had the same spiritual power, and yet they were tempted and overcome by the evil affections and lusts, because the grace of God is something that may be lost. Predestinarians and perfectionists claim that no matter how long and how severely the regenerate man may be tempted he cannot yield to temptation and fall from grace. The Word of God, however, clearly teaches that while the Christian need not, yet he may at any time yield to temptation and fall from grace. Hence the divine injunction—"Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life."

The regenerate man still sins, and therefore, may at any time yield to temptation and fall from grace. "There is none righteous, no one." God could create a world and people it with beings who cannot sin, but they would be creatures without any moral life, lacking the powers of motion, speech and song. Since then, there is nothing like perfection, or absolute power of grace in the heart of man, how may the Christian in temptation know that his religion is not a mere sham, and that he is at least relatively secure against falling from grace? He has a knowledge of this glorious truth from the consciousness of spiritual power to resist and overcome certain petty sins. Every man has his own peculiar weaknesses. The easier it becomes for him to resist and overcome these individual sins, the greater progress has he made in religion. Then it can be seen too in his love for charity. Every Christian loves to do good, or by the power of the Spirit wills to do good. As soon as the will, overcoming temptation, decides for good, the man is good; as soon as the will, yielding to temptation, decides for evil, the man is evil. The Christian has dominion over the carnal desire, which he overcomes by the power of the Spirit. The difference between the Christian and the human heart generally is that the struggle in the regenerate man is waged out of

love for God, in the man of the world out of love for self. The struggle takes place in man, not outside of him. The desire of the flesh goes contrary to the Spirit, and the desire of the Spirit contrary to the flesh. Hence, when a Christian yields to temptation and falls from grace it is an altogether different thing from the man of the world doing the same thing. The Christian, yielding to temptation and falling grace, denies the faith; the unconverted man sins against natural love. The Christian, neglecting to provide for his own, is hurt both spiritually and morally; the unregenerate man only morally. The Christian knows what the conflict means; the unbeliever does not. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, because they are foolishness unto him; neither indeed can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

The Christian has resources in and obtains power from the Word of God to resist and to overcome temptation. He must never be led astray by the erroneous notion that this power comes from his own heart. "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts; murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." This is the mistaken idea of all religious enthusiasts, who believe that religion consists in mere emotion, making men carnally secure. True Christians know that the purpose of temptation is to guard against becoming carnally secure, and to prepare them for the great conflict between good and evil. As men, desiring to become good soldiers must be drilled for conflict; so men, desiring to become good Christians must become so by experience. Trials and temptations are instruments in the hands of God, not for evil but for good. Ultimately all trials are of God; but temptations may be of the devil. The object never tempts. A gold dollar, lying on the table, tempts no one; because it is a creature of God. The devil, however, may make use of that object to lead some one into temptation. A house is something physical and as such does not affect our souls. If we admire the house, because we love art, and thank God for His goodness, it becomes a blessing, but as soon as we have inordinate desires it affords

a temptation. The history of the world in so far as it is good, affords a blessing, but in so far as it is evil, a temptation. The beautiful works of God themselves may be employed as means for temptation. Satan, tempting Christ on the mountain, pointed to the glories of the world and said "All these things will I give unto thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed, lest he fall."

God imparts grace to the believing soul, that it may resist and overcome temptation. This grace is freedom from the bonds of sin and death. This freedom is power to flee to Christ for refuge. With this comforting thought, the Christian in temptation, turns from the consideration of the present to the anticipation of the glorious future. He still fears temptation, because it may end in death—spiritual and eternal death. Death is the antithesis of life. It is the loss of the new, that spiritual, that endless life bestowed by Christ as a gift of grace. Every time the Christian sins he wounds his spiritual body or soul, and this wound may result in death. Soldiers in battle are wounded by bullets and swords, and these wounds may result in death; but the wounded soldiers know that such wounds may be healed, and hence anticipate with joy the time, when their aching bodies shall be made whole. The Christian in temptation receives spiritual wounds, which may end in eternal death; but he also knows that these wounds shall be healed, and hence anticipates with joy the day when his wounded soul shall be made perfect again. Spiritual wounds shall be healed, and imperfect souls shall be made perfect. If it were not so, there would be spiritual cripples in heaven. God is faithful and will make that which is imperfect here, perfect hereafter.

The temptations in the present are but the preparation for glory in the future. The Christian in temptation, anticipating this glory in faith, sees future life, which he will attain after death, in hope. Earth's beauty and splendor may fade away in darkness; the everlasting hills, garlanded with a coronal of clouds, swinging their summits among the stars, may crumble into dust; the stars, that have given light for

centuries without dimming their luster and brilliancy, may fall from the skies; the heavens, the beautiful firmament, the visible skies may pass away with great commotion and yet the Eternal One, whom the powers of decay cannot touch, sitting on a throne of never-ending majesty will govern the universe. The pearly gates will swing ajar; the golden streets of the city with jaspar walls not made with hands will appear; the silvery harps of angels will play the sweet melodies of heaven. The wicked will cease from troubling; nature will take up again her morning song of joy; and the Christian in temptation, having overcome all evil by the grace of God, will receive the crown of glory that fadeth away. Amen.

THE CONSTANT NEED AND THE WIDE SCOPE OF THE CHURCH'S MISSIONARY WORK.

BY REV. M. H. HOCKMAN, LANCASTER, OHIO.

The work of Missions consists in *sending*, or carrying the Gospel of Jesus Christ to those who have it not — Heathen Missions — and also in developing and unfolding the requirements of this gospel in those who may have already received it — Home or Inner Missions. This activity of the Church then works both extensively and intensively. It brings others into unison with God's people on the one hand, and on the other strengthens and deepens the bond of union that binds the Christian to Christ.

The means needed for carrying on or performing this work is the same provided in the divine word for saving a lost and ruined world, viz. the word of God, the Sacrament of Baptism, or the new birth and the Sacrament of the Altar, or of the development and growth in the life of grace and of conformity to Christ.

The duty that is here enjoined upon the Church by Christ is seen in the direction: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not,

shall be damned." Mark 16, 15.16. "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." Matt. 28, 19. 20.

The objects to be attained in this work of Missions are so great and glorious, as well as so fully in accord with the life and spirit of Christianity that it may well claim the earnest and active interest of every true and faithful child of God. It is exemplified in the life of the Savior and clearly enjoined in the Word of God upon every follower of Christ, and should receive a hearty response and a willing support from all who bear His name or profess obedience to His holy will and word. As the whole Church — every member of it, shares in the blessings of redemption and salvation, so too does every one without exception, to the extent of his or her ability, share in the obligations and requirements growing out of deliverance from sin and the glories of salvation. Our obligations and duties grow out of and are proportionate to our mercies and our privileges. Much is required of him to whom much has been given, while loving obedience and childlike submission to the will of the Master is due from every one of His subjects or followers, however weak or humble he may be.

The need for missionary work, even in so-called Christian lands, continues from generation to generation. The development and growth of the Christian until he is brought into full and entire conformity to the divine mind and will is a process of growth extending to the end of the life in the flesh. The Christian ripens into fitness for heaven only as and when he ripens out of the present life. What a field for this phase or part of mission work alone! No sooner is this work completed in one generation than another is born into the world, calling upon the Church for a repetition of the same sanctifying effort that claimed her attention in the past. On an average three generations are born and die in a century. Thrice, then, within this time

must this work be performed — a work so vast and so great that the constant and the earnest efforts of every child of God will find abundant room and urgent call for the exercise of his supreme effort and his every ability. The harvest is plenteous, the laborers are few. The earnest efforts of all are needed that the ripening grain may be gathered into the heavenly granary, and not scattered on the earth to be destroyed by beasts or birds. But great as is the field here presented for our contemplation and our husbandry, how vastly is it enlarged when in addition we include the multiplied millions of heathendom whose more than Macedonian cry for help, for light and for salvation through our aid, echo through the centuries from many lands and from the isles of the sea. Millions upon millions long for the light and the liberty of the gospel. More, perhaps, than half the human family do not even know of Jesus, the only Savior from sin. Though they long for help and ignorantly worship the unknown God, unlike the Greeks at Athens they have no Paul to preach and declare this unknown God to them. This is part of the work the Savior asks of us. Do we realize its vastness and importance, and are we earnestly and faithfully striving for a conscientious performance of the duty? In love the Savior asks the service at our hands. Do we as faithful servants yield an earnest and hearty response? "If ye love me, keep my commands," is His earnest counsel and loving warning.

It is because of the missionary efforts of the Church in the past that we now have the blessed gospel and possess the treasures of life and salvation, and it is by means of like efforts on our part that those still destitute of these may be blessed with all their comforts and joys for time and for eternity. How reasonable the service here asked! How glorious the result of its loving and hearty rendering! May love warm the heart and strengthen the hand that this glorious result may attend this reasonable service faithfully rendered to God's glory and man's bountiful blessing!

The need of constant, uninterrupted missionary work is found, not so much in the fact that generations come and

go, are born and die, but rather in this, that men are born into the world in a state of sin and enmity to God, exposed to His judgments and hostile to His law and will. Born of flesh, corrupt and depraved flesh, they are flesh, not subject to God's will, nor can they be, unless born anew of water and the Spirit into the Kingdom of God with the life and nature of Christ planted in them. By nature man is not a good, but an evil tree. As such he neither does nor can produce good fruit. Only after its own kind does and can the tree and the seed bring forth. Unless the tree is first made good it is impossible for it to produce good fruit. "Ye must be born again," and that not by natural human means or instrumentalities, but by divine activity and power; not by the powers of nature, but by those of grace; not by the agency of man, but that of God.

It is a delusion and a snare of Satan that man in his natural state needs only a Reformation, and not a Regeneration — that, after all, he is not so badly off but that he by his own efforts can provide all that is necessary to secure God's favor and everlasting life. This delusion, minimizing as it does the enormity of sin and the glories of redemption through Christ, is agreeable and palatable to the natural mind and will, but it successfully accomplishes its purpose in robbing man of salvation and leaving him in bondage to Satan and captivity to death and hell, for how can man's futile efforts provide an adequate satisfaction for appeasing the wrath of a holy God against sinful man when this very effort is an additional transgression of His will and a rejection of His love in refusing the only and the all-sufficient salvation He has provided in and through His dear Son? It would seem to be self-evident folly and insane ignorance to expect present guilt to find pardon in the commission of additional sin and consequently the increase of guilt.

"None so blind as they who will not see"—
None such fools as they who spurn the true,
Yet court the false of darkest form and hue.

To the whole Church, as represented in the Apostles — not to any part or parcel thereof merely — is this missionary work assigned. It is a duty laid upon every child of God. All, however, may not be required to engage in every feature of this work. Every one is not called upon in person to preach the gospel in his own individual congregation. For this he may neither be prepared nor called. Still, whatever talent or ability he may possess for providing this work for himself and his fellow church members he is in duty bound to employ and can shirk only at his peril. How greatly and how effectually he can aid in preaching the gospel to himself and his brethren when he aids in providing educational institutions for the proper training of those who do preach the Word and dispense the sacraments for the saving of souls and the glory of God. In like manner, too, can every member of the Church aid in preaching the gospel beyond his own individual congregation throughout the land and among the nations of the earth. Here is an open door through which all who love the Lord may find a field large and promising enough to claim their loftiest and lasting efforts. Is a larger round of efforts desired by any? This is afforded us in providing adequate means for the religious training of the young; Christian homes for the orphans and the needy aged; hospitals and nurses for the sick and suffering; an efficient Board of Aid for struggling missionary congregations, etc., etc. The objects here suggested are varied and great enough to meet the wishes and secure the interests and active efforts of all who would prove their faith by their works. To those, then, who are not busily employed, in keen rebuke it may be said: "Why stand ye here all the day idle?"

And why shall we not be encouraged to go on and increase our efforts in pushing the work of missions? Has not God put the seal of His approval on what we have already done in this direction? When has He so richly blessed us as a Church, lengthening our chords and strength-

ening our stakes, as He has done since we have made a modest systematic effort in our missionary work? Congregation has been added to congregation, pastoral charge to pastoral charge, synod to synod. As compared with our abilities and the opportunities offered we have only made a beginning in this work, however. Let the ingatherings of our first sowing increase our interest and to add to our efforts until these show something of an approach to our actual abilities and the harvest become proportionate in amount to the faithfulness of the Church in sowing and the richness of God in blessing!

NOTES.

G. H. S.

FIGHTING THE AWAY FROM ROME MOVEMENT.

For a long time it was the policy of the Catholic authorities in Austria to ignore the Protestant agitation that developed such strength in the Away from Rome propaganda. This has, however, all been changed and in recent months the Catholics are put out and in arms against the spread of a movement that has already won over some twenty-five thousand adherents, built a score of Protestant churches where none had existed since the terrible days of the counter Reformation and has assumed almost the proportions of a crusade, that promises to be permanent and thorough. These latter features especially have forced the church people to action, certain recent facts showing how terribly in earnest the Protestant leaders are and how good the soil is upon which the Gospel seed is sown. Only a few months ago the bookdealer Robert Grassmann, a veteran controversionalist of 87 in Stettin, published a brochure containing nothing practically but extracts from the mornal theology of the great Jesuit Liguori, and al-

though forbidden to be circulated in the Austrian Empire, this indictment of modern Roman Catholicism in a short time had the phenomenal circulation of 320,000 in 104 different editions. The historical and scientific work of the most prominent recent convert from Catholicism, the ex-Jesuit Count Hoenstroech, "*Das Papsttum in seiner Social-Kulturellen Wirksamkeit,*" consisting largely of extracts from approved church authors on the influence of the Papacy on civilization and the progress of thought, is appearing in new editions in rapid succession, although an expensive book, and its circulation in Austria has not been prevented by its prohibition from the mails. The Catholic journals accordingly no longer keep their readers ignorant of the extent of the danger. The Linzer *Volksblatt* recently wrote:

"We are in the midst of a religious war. The stealing of souls has been begun in Austria and is constantly spreading and assuming larger dimensions. Although Protestanism is split into an endless number of sects and sectlets, confessions, creeds, and churches, yet it has succeeded in mobilizing all its forces and attacking the Catholic church with all of its power. Its agents are going from city to city, scattering pamphlets as thick as snowflakes, calling together meeting after meeting, and inaugurating a regular crusade to have the members of the Catholic church apostatize. They attack the Catholic church, the Catholic clergy, the Catholic dogmas, with all the weapons that lies and slander can produce. Protestanism has begun an offensive war against Catholicism, and it is now high time that we organize a thorough defense."

Another prominent Catholic journal, the *Korrespondenzblatt,* reports: "The apostasy has assumed such proportions that Protestanism has gained a firm foothold in at least forty places where they had nothing before." The paper accordingly appeals to Catholics to pray that these crusades may cease, and that in the sermons and in the

religious instructions in the schools, the great sin of apostsy be fully explained to the faithful. One thing particularly vexes the Catholic authorities, namely, the agitation of the friends of the movement in the Parliament, who, in the form of special appeals and interpellations addressed to the ministers, manage to have strong professions of Protestant tenets and sharp arraignments of Catholic teaching printed in the official records of that body. Protests against this use of a technical right of the Protestant minority made by the Catholic majority have been loud and long, but so far without avail. In addition special anti-Protestant meetings are being held throughout the empire. In Vienna the Jesuit fathers Freund and Kolb have inaugurated a series of protest meetings in the famous St. Stephen's church, and the Jesuit father Abel organized a public protest procession, in which some 8,000 men participated, including several hundred representatives of the noblity and 3,000 women, the purpose being to show to all of the enemies of the church and the state that the heart of Austria intends to remain Catholic and Austrian." The latter statement can be understood when it is remembered that the Protestant movement is everywhere branded as hostile to the empire and favoring an absorption of the German parts of Austria by Germany. In other cities protest meetings against the proceedings in Parliament have been held, and in Linz even an "atonement communion" has been celebrated by the Catholic women. University circles, too, have been drawn into the clash of opinions. In Graz the rector, Dr. Weiss, refused to permit the students to join the Gustavus Adolphus, or Protestant Mission Society, and also to meet to discuss the Away from Rome movement. The students then held a mass meeting in which, by a vote of all against two, the breach of academic freedom was denounced. The charge is now being made again and again that the converts are bought for 30 florins and the money is furnished by the Protestants of other lands. Even as prominent a man

as Prince Max Egon of Fürstenberg, a prominent Catholic member of the Parliament, declared publicly that the price of a convert was 25 florins. When forced for particulars by other members he confessed that he knew this only as a "rumor" and had not intended to publish it to the world. Episodes like these, which could readily be duplicated, show the intensity of feeling developed by the Away from Rome contest.

Columbus Theological Magazine.

THIS Magazine is designed to supply the want of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim is the exposition and defense of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers, 35 cents.

All remittances should be addressed to LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, Columbus, Ohio. All communications pertaining to the Editorial Department and all exchanges to PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., Columbus, Ohio.

"The Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20, 28.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

IN ITS FOUNDATION, ESSENCE, APPEARANCE AND WORK.

By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.

Prompted by the purest motive, the desire to serve his Master by being helpful to his fellow-laborers, fully conscious that the unscriptural views on the subject endanger the soul and should be exposed, and confident "that the King will accompany it with His blessing," the author wrote and published this work.

"This work is notable for its comprehensive and yet simple analysis of its subject, and for its earnest devotion to the practical topics and problems that spring out of the Church life at every point." — *Lutheran Church Review.*

"The work is carefully prepared and well written. — *Lutheran Observer.*

The book contains 364 pages and sells for $1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

THE LUTHERAN COMMENTARY

By Scholars of the Lutheran Church in the United States under the editorial charge of Dr. H. E. Jacobs. This is a very valuable work and especially adapted to the wants of Pastors and Sunday-school Teachers. The 12 volumes bound in full cloth have been reduced in price from $2.00 to $1.50 per volume. We would call special attention to volume VI on the Acts of the Apostles by Dr. F. W. Stellhorn. Having too large a number on hand we will sell this volume until our stock is exhausted, at $1.25 per volume. Address :: :: :: :: :: ::

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 E. MAIN ST., COLUMBUS. O.

MODEL SERMONS. SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

By DR. M. LOY, Dean in Capital University.

These sermons are first scriptural then logical; noted for their simplicity in style and depth of thought, in full harmony with the confessions of the Lutheran Church. Preachers need these sermons as models, teachers will want them to use in the public service in the absence of the pastor, parents will find them to be just what they need in the home service on Sunday, and any Christian, young or old, will find in them the Manna which came down from heaven by which his soul is nourished unto eternal life.

Price, plain cloth, $2.50; half leather, $3.00; half morocco, $4.00;
Imitation morocco, two volumes, $4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

BEFORE THE ALTAR

OR A SERIES OF ANNOTATED PROPOSITIONS ON LITURGICS, TO WHICH IS ADDED A SELECTION OF STANDARD FORMS.

By Dr. C. H. L. Schuette.

The author in his introduction remarks: "The writer will consider himself amply repaid for his labor, if this little book shall add to the number of those among God's people who worship 'with understanding:' and if ministers will take up the subject as it is here outlined and discuss it before their people, say in a course of lectures, there can be no doubt as to the result."

Price, bound in cloth, 75 cents; flexible, $1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

CHRISTIAN PRAYER

By M. LOY, D. D.

This book is in fact an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Pastors are inquiring for sermons on the catechism. There is nothing better in the English language on this, the third part of the catechism. Eight articles treat *The Model Prayer* in a general way, four explain and emphasize the words "Our Father." "Hallowed be Thy Name" is explained in three articles; "Thy Kingdom Come" in four. "Thy Will be Done" in seven articles, and "Give us this day our Daily Bread" in five." "Forgive us our Debts" is treated in five articles, and each of the remaining parts of the prayer is treated in four articles. Besides all this there are fifteen articles on "The Practice of Prayer," concluding with an article on the question: "Have You Family Worship?"

People who never pray should read this book that they may be brought to a sense of their duty and privilege. Those who have not been neglecting this Christian privilege will be encouraged to continue on the right way.

Price, 75 Cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

THE MEANS OF GRACE

BY REV. G. T. COOPERRIDER, A. M.

It furnishes a clear and adequate explanation of the Word and Sacraments, God's own appointed means for conveying to us His grace unto our salvation, rather in the light of a practical, broad interpreter than as a treatise of technicalities.

Handsomely Bound in full cloth, XIV and 157 pages. Per copy, 75 cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL
DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH

Edited by Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D., Columbus, Ohio.

VOL. XXV JUNE 1905 NO. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE.

EDITORIAL COMMENT. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 129

THE SCIENCE THAT RULES THE DAY. By Rev. C. B. Gohdes, A. M 139

STUDIES IN VEDIC RELIGION. By Rev. Ernest Schultz..... 150

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES CONCERNING ORIGINAL SIN. By Rev. A. F. Rohr, A. M..... 160

NOTES. By G. H. S..... 186

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN
55-57-59 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, OHIO

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.
Vol. XXV. JUNE, 1905. No. 3.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

I. THE BIBLE STUDY OF THE PASTOR.

It ought to be practically a self-evident matter that the conscientious Lutheran pastor is a devoted student of the Word of God. Theoretical and practical considerations of the most momentous kind make such work a *sine qua non* of pastoral success. The formal principle of the Reformation demands that the Scriptures and these alone are the final court of appeal in all matters of evangelical faith and Christian life. Over against the principle of ecclesiastical authority, which is the backbone of the Roman Catholic system, the Church of the Reformation has set up the principle of the authority of the Scriptures. With this principle Protestantism as such must stand and fall. Wherever this principle is denied, either thetically or practically, as is the case with modern radical theology, there Evangelical Protestantism has ceased to exist, even if the time honored name be retained. In Germany Ex-Court Preacher Stöcker and other theologians of the more positive type, are demanding that those who deny the fundamentals of the historic Protestant faith, such as the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the Atonement and the like, should sever their connection with the existing Protestant churches and from organizations of their own that will give expression and confession to such neological principles. This the radicals refuse to do; but the demand is justified, and they should go. Protestantism cannot live without the authority of

the Scriptures; and discarding this principle it does not deserve to live but merits that disintegration which the Roman Catholic theologians have for centuries predicted would be her fate.

Again, the Bible is for the pastor or a preacher the one sole source of strength and success. One of the glories of the Lutheran system is her doctrine of the Word and the Sacraments as the means of grace; the Lutheran pastor knows exactly where he will find that spirit upon which he is absolutely and solely dependent for the work he purposes to do in the hearts of men. It is found in the Word, be this the oral or the visible word. Church methods are in the main matters that he needs to study but little, as he knows that it is the Word which is to do the work in the hearts of men. Nothing, accordingly, could be of greater importance to the pastor than the most intimate knowledge of that Word, whence he is to draw his inspiration and his power. A Roman Catholic from his standpoint can neglect the Word, as he only too often does; but a Lutheran or any Protestant cannot afford to do so. It is practically spiritual and pastoral suicide for him to do so.

But considerations of other kinds only emphasize this demand. There is no more timely study than direct research in the Word of God. The Bible is not only officially but practically too the centre of discussion and debate in the Protestant world of to-day. It is the cynosure of all eyes, unfortunately, however, not always with a view of its defence or of strengthening the Protestant principle. In only too many cases among Protestants themselves, the opposite is the case, the tendency, e. g. of the so-called Higher Criticism being decidedly to undermine the Scriptures. If the attack came from without, from the historical opponents of the Word, the Roman Catholics, the difficulty would not be so great. But the fact of the matter is, that the Protestant house itself is on fire. The Romish Church is now the *tertius gaudens* as the different parties within the Protestant fold fight each other in regard to the principle which alone justifies the existence of the Protes-

tant Church as such. No matter how much the Lutheran pastor may, like the ostrich, hide his head in the sand, hoping thereby to escape the enemy, and say that the Lutheran Church is not endangered by the attacks of the Higher Critics. It is true that our church in America — but not in Germany — has been wonderfully, almost miraculously preserved in this great treachery to the fundamental Protestant principle. But nevertheless the great problems of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures, their divine character and authoritative position are in the air, and our members too will more or less be influenced by the discussion of such problems in magazines, journals, books, etc. We cannot keep our people ignorant of these things even if we would. Least of all should the pastor think it unnecessary to study the Biblical problems in their modern phases and forms. Not that he needs to go into the particulars and details; for this is both impossible and unnecessary, except for the specialist. But the underlying principles, and motives, heart and kernel of the agitation, every pastor should intelligently understand. Ignorance is not orthodoxy; and a Protestant pastor who is orthodox simply as a matter of traditional stubbornness, because he will not look intelligently and in a fair-minded manner into the real problems of the day is, in his spirit and method, Roman Catholic, with this difference, that he takes church traditions in doctrinal and other matters as his basis where the Roman Catholic takes the word of his church.

A Protestant pastor accordingly owes it to himself and to his work to make a thorough, conscientious study of the Scriptural basis of the teachings of his church. To be well grounded in the faith does not mean to know what the theologians or even the confessions, good as all these are, say on the subject, but what the Scriptures say. A pastor is to be an independent student of the word, also for the purpose of testing the theologians and the Confessions. Every Christian pastor is personally responsible to his God for what he teaches and believes and for that reason must be independent of theologians and Confessions also. For

what he says he must be able to point to the "Thus saith the Word."

And this means a good deal more than at first glance seems to be the case. None will theoretically differ from what has been stated above; but the application of the principle to practice is often more than defective. In our discussions and debates at Synods and Conferences the Scriptures are not ignored; but only too often are Scriptural citations and proofs merely added as a formal appendix to discussions that have been decided on dogmatical and other grounds. Only too often are passages merely cited as proofs, which in themselves, correct indeed, are disputed as proof passages and will convince none except those who are convinced beforehand. How often is the passage from John 3 concerning the regeneration by water and the Holy Ghost cited as proof for baptism and baptismal regeneration, and only in exceptional cases is ever mention made of the fact, that large bodies of earnest Christians, who are probably just as anxious to live up to the authority of the Scripture as we are, maintain that this passage has no reference to baptism at all, as there is nothing in the connection that points to baptism. In such matters it is the duty of the pastor intelligently to understand the difficulties and justify in his own eyes the use that his church has made of the Scriptures as proof for her doctrines. We Lutheran pastors make our Bible study too easy. It is in many cases more formal than real work. It is much easier to take traditional exegesis and simply appropriate what past generations of theologians have thought out. It is true, that in most cases the work of the past generation is better than that of our own in Bible study; but this only makes it all the more imperative that we appropriate what they did, not traditionally but independently, going over the same processes that they did and seeing if the reasons for their interpretations are valid and acceptable. Besides, in details at least, especially from the side of the externals of the Scriptures, modern Bible study has gone beyond the fathers, and these things too the pastor is to examine and to retain

of them what is good. Intense, earnest, hard, and above all other things, intelligent and independent Bible study, should keep the Lutheran pastor of our day busy at his desk every moment he can spare from his direct congregation's duties. It does not seem to be the case that the pastors of our church are doing their full duty in this respect. It is rather to our shame that the bulk of the researches that are made by American theologians and directed against the Higher Critics come from outside of the Lutheran Church. The voice of our theologians is practically not heard in this great debate. The pages of our magazines show how little our pastors do in this direction; and yet the Lutheran clergy should be in the front rank of this battle. We are the first to criticize the innovations of the "advanced" theologian, yet in the scientific work of defeating them we are among the least and the last. The radicals again and again, especially in Germany, boast of it, that no promising young theologian stands with the defenders of the old views and that it is next thing to impossible to secure competent conservative young men for theological professorships. There is some truth in this; but this truth should only spur on Lutherans who have their very existence at stake in this matter, to do better and more work of this kind. This is, of necessity, an age of concentration and specialization. *Let the Lutheran pastor concentrate himself on honest and intelligent Bible work.*

II. THE PASTOR'S WORK IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES OF THE BIBLE.

The good old days when the average pastor was a fair student in the original languages of the Bible, the Hebrew and the Greek, seem to be gone by; but we hope not forever. There are so many books *about* the Bible to read and study, that not a few seem to forget that the *Bible itself* should be the chief object of the pastor's study. The demands of general culture and literature are so great, that seemingly the pastor can no longer concentrate himself in his study upon

the one thing that is needful. There are days of the *multa* but not of the *multum;* and accordingly our interests are wide and superficial, but not deep. Our pastors' libraries are now much larger than they were a generation ago, but are they as good? Are we not engaged in too many *allotria?* Have not some of us "fads" that take up a good deal of our time and attention, that could be devoted to something better?

The old saying,warning us to be on our guard against "the man of one book," in the good application of this sentiment, is nowhere of greater significance than in the case of the pastor, provided this one book is the Scripture. And naturally this means the study of this book in the languages in which the Holy Spirit caused it to be written, for only in these tongues can it be investigated in its whole length, breadth and depth.

Not as though the Scriptures are to a greater degree the means of grace in the original tongues than they are in translations. Were this the case then the average layman would be seriously disadvantaged against the technical scholar. Besides this it is not the external word as such that the Holy Spirit has selected as the medium through which He conveys His power, but it is the great truths that are revealed in the Word, whether this word be in the original or in translation.

The considerations that call for an earnest study of the Scriptures in the original languages are of a different character, and are based upon the special call and work of the minister as the embassador of Christ and of God. In the Bible the minister finds in official form the message with which he as the representative of his Lord is entrusted for the walfare of souls. What a sad and deplorable anomaly if he is not himself able to read this message himself, but must depend upon others to do this for him! And this is practically and actually the case with every minister who cannot read his Hebrew Old Testament and his Greek New Testament. Without this ability he is *entirely dependent upon secondary sources* for his knowledge and his understanding

of the Word of God. If other men had not done what he will not do, and had they not acquired the ability of translating the Scriptures into a language which he can understand, he would not be able to know anything about the Scriptures at all. He is entirely dependent on the industry, learning and skill of others for what he can know of the message he is to proclaim. Worse than this, he is compelled to accept what they give him solely on their authority. A pastor without a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek is not in a condition to decide whether a translation offered him is correct or not; whether it is the Word of God or not. He must accept the work of others blindly and cannot in the least control the results of the work of others in this respect. A pastor of this kind is not able to go to first sources for his knowledge of the Scriptures nor to study the *verba ipsissima* of the Prophets and the Evangelists. He is in a deplorable ignorance as to the very message that he is to preach, and is solely and alone dependent on the charity of others. Nor can he even make proper use of the commentaries and other helps offered him for his Bible work, if he knows little or nothing of the Bible languages. In fact, his whole Biblical study is mostly blind groping in the dark, and largely guess-work. For the pastor it should be a moral demand that he makes upon himself to study these languages. He should not be content or be able to satisfy his conscience until he has made all the efforts possible for him to get as near as possible to the very words of revelation.

But how get the time for such work in addition to the pulpit and pastoral demands made upon the average minister? Simply by taking the time. No excuse is more fluent, and shall it be said more flippant? than that advanced so often, "I have not the time." We will generally find that if a person is very anxious to do something, he will also find the time for doing it. Where there is a will there is a way, is true in a most particular sense here too. If a pastor could once be convinced that it is his *duty* to study the Word in the very form in which it came from the Holy Spirit, there would be no occasion or call to complain about a lack of time.

Carefully to husband and divide one's time is largely the secret of success in the ministerial calling. A proper appreciation of time, especially of the spare moments, is the key to abundant work. It is hard to conceive of a pastor so busy that he cannot acquire the ability to study the text upon what he bases his preaching in the form in which God gives it to him. A minister certainly should be a student now if ever in the history of the Church, and above all should be a student of the Word and to center his heart and mind on this Word in the language in which it pleased God to give it to the Church, for which this Word is the sole guide of faith and life.

III. THE HUMAN FACTOR IN THE SCRIPTURES.

This has practically become a technical term in modern Biblical research. It is used most of all among those who are antagonistic to the traditional views of the Evangelical Church on the subject of the plenary or verbal inspiration of the Scriptures and for this reason too is usually employed to establish the claim that the Scriptures are not absolutely inerrant or faultless.

The term, however, correctly applied, is intended to emphasize a truth concerning the Scriptures and for that reason it has come to stay. It can be used in a perfectly legitimate sense, and, as is the case with such expressions as "Higher criticism," and others that are abused in the interests of a false science, the purpose should be rather clearly to state what the underlying germ of truth is, which this term should express. Briefly stated, the human factor in revelation is everything in the human circumstances or surroundings of the people to whom the Biblical books are written which induced the Holy Spirit, the author of the Scriptures, to put these writings in exactly the form in which we find them and none other. It could, of course, be possible that a book could be written which neither in its contents nor form would be influenced by such external features. Discussion as abstract or Kant's Critique or Aristotle's Metaphysics are practically independent of all historical surroundings. This is, how-

ever, not the case with the majority of the books of the Bible. Some of these are to a great extent of such a character. The book of Job has substantially the same significance for us, whether it be placed in the age of Moses or of Solomon or of the Exile; nor does it matter if it was written in Israel or elsewhere. Its contents are so abstract and purely intellectual and spiritual that we really need to know nothing of time, author, or place of composition in order to understand its purpose. The majority of the books of the Bible are, however, of such a nature that all these external human and historical features have had more or less to do with the form and condition in which the eternal truths of God's revelation are found. An example or two will illustrate what is meant by the human factor in revelation in the legitimate sense of the term. The New Testament is not written in Latin or in Persian, but in Greek. Why? Because in the days of the Apostles the current language of international communication was the Greek, and this fact of human history explains why these Apostles did not write in their native dialect but in one that was foreign to them. Again, at a certain stage in His teaching career Christ adopted the parabolic method of instruction, changing to this suddenly. Why? He tells us this Himself, that His purpose was after the leaders of the Jews had become so hardened that they *could* not hear, that now He would teach in a way that they *should* not hear. His purpose in this case was not to reveal but to conceal thought. The fact that the leaders of the people had become hardened caused Christ to adopt a new method of instruction. It was a human element that gave form to His instructions. Again, in the Epistle to the Corinthians Paul discusses such central doctrines of Christianity as the resurrection of the dead and the Lord's Supper, not abstractly, but in antagonism to abuses of these doctrines that became current in that congregation. Why? Because he thereby wanted to counteract these abuses, and this factor in the people determined the shape and form in which these doctrines are elucidated. In Romans Paul discusses the doctrine of justification by faith more negatively than posi-

tively. He is at least as much concerned about proving that justification does *not* take place on account of the merits of man as to show that it *does* take place through grace. Why? Simply because he wanted to meet the Jewish doctrine of work-righteousness, which was current everywhere and, as it were, was in the air of that time. This condition of affairs among the people to whom he wrote caused him to give his argument the shape which it has in this grand epistle.

Examples of this sort can be multiplied almost *ad infinitum*. That the knowledge of these influences that in this way shaped and formed the revelation as given in many Old and New Testament books materially helps to the understanding of these books goes without saying. If we knew the exact conditions in Corinth and Rome and Galatia we no doubt would be able to understand better many things which are now enigmas to us in Paul's letters to these congregations. The interpretation of some of the books of the Scriptures is notoriously difficult and almost impossible for the very reason that we do not know their historical background. As example of this, we need mention only the Psalms. If we knew the occasion for so many more of the noble lyrics than we do, how much better we would understand what they mean. As it is, only too much in the intrepretation of these psalms, as is the case also in many portions of the prophets, is little better than guesswork. Exegesis has profited by the recognition of the human factor in revelation and many Scriptural passages and thoughts have become all the clearer because the Bible student has learned to appeal to this source for further light. *Mutatis mutandis,* the old German hermeneutical saying, that if we would understand a poet we must go into the country of the poet, applies to the Scriptures also. Put yourself as much as possible in the place of the original writer of the Biblical books, and you can understand them as you otherwise could not. Here is connection with this human factor in the Scriptures, although abused shamefully in the interests of rationalism, the old truth is still a truth, viz.: *abusus non tollit usum.*

THE SCIENCE THAT RULES THE DAY.

BY REV. C. B. GOHDES, A. M., BALTIMORE, MD.

We like to boast of the conquests of Christianity. To spur our Christian people to greater efforts in the support of missions we exhibit charts showing the diminishing area of heathendom, and figures showing the progress of the Gospel according to the laws of geometrical progression. Yet such figures are very elusive. While the religion of Christ makes conquests among pagans, this precious heritage is repudiated by its own beneficiaries. To what extent is art under the influence of Christianity? To what extent is current literature consecrated to the cross and permeated by the leaven of religion? In what sense is modern education a handmaid of Christianity? While indirectly the creation of the Church, the modern university is enlisted in an iconoclastic warfare against what the ages have treasured. The Haeckels, the Spencers, the Tyndalls of the day are the Julians of modern times. Revealed religion is to them a superstition, and the passage of the Savior through death to glory receives no more respectful consideration from them than the effort of the alchemist to transmute base metal into gold.

Modern education, generally speaking, is heathenish. The modern university is the banner bearer of a remorseless unbelief. Materialistic monism rules the day. It recognizes only matter as real, and all life is interpreted as motion of the material substance with which it is correlated. It does not look up to the sunny heights of heaven as the origin of life, but to the primordial ooze. The beautiful universe suggests to the materialistic philosopher not an omnipotent creative hand, but — a protoplasm of potential omnipotence.

If Christianity is to hold its own, if it is to recover the lost vantage ground, if it is to leaven the world's thought in all its phases, as it can and ought, it will have to set itself the task of meeting the onslaughts of monism.

That the Christian Church must look upon materialistic science as antagonistic to itself and the high interests which it represents, is evident when we consider the status of biology, a science which Haeckel claims, will ultimately furnish the key to the riddle of the universe. Whence life? We do not put forth the absurd claim that the Bible should be made the text book of science. God has not revealed to man generally what he can ascertain by dint of studious research from the book of nature. What is beyond the searchlight of the human reason, God has graciously revealed in as far as man's welfare requires it. The first chapter of the book of Genesis is a grand outline of biological science furnishing the framework which a true science will seek to fill out. Whence life? We ask again only to answer unhesitatingly: From the absolute life, which is God. The advocate of a materialistic monism, however, wastes his time by trying to prove that life is the result of physico-chemical reactions. "Let certain chemical substances be mixed under certain conditions and life will result," such is the dictum of the pundits of Chicago University. Assuming the truth of the evolution theory, the creation of life in a chemical laboratory would indeed furnish the key to the riddle of the universe. Without a trace of hesitancy and fear we venture to predict that organic beings will not result from the mixture of inorganic substances excepting in the crucibles of God. Let our Chicago professors take warning from the experience of the Egyptian magicians. In the book of Exodus we read: "The Lord said unto Moses: Say unto Aaron, Stretch out thy rod, and smite the dust of the land, that it may become lice throughout the land of Egypt. And they did so; for Aaron stretched out his hand with his rod, and smote the dust of the earth, and it became lice throughout all the land of Egypt. And the magicians did so with their enchantments, to bring forth lice, *but they could not.*" Neither can the chemists of Chicago or Jena. If they found lice (or microbes) in their crucibles after certain

chemical operations, it is because they had put them in their carelessness.

That modern biological science makes no distinction between vital and material energy proper, such as gravity, magnetism, electricity, heat and others, is the very climax of blindness. The fact that the operations of vital forces result in the attainment of an ideal organism, capable of life and propagation, shows the untenableness of explaining vital energy as the motion of matter. Take the embryo within the shell of an egg. According to the tenets of modern biology every organ in the animal body is the result of a utilitarian scheme of nature and passes away when the necessity for its use has ceased. Thus the anthropoid ape lost his tail when he left the Eden of his arbored mansions. Then, how does it come that the embryo of a bird within a shell which is nourished altogether by superficially absorbing the nutriment with which it finds itself surrounded, develops stomach and entrails and wings. Truly a prophetic and creative instinct of chemical forces!

Amazing is the unscientific reasoning of materialistic science when we contemplate the processes of vital chemistry in the womb. What dumb chemical force can that be which at the earliest stage of molecular development differentiates the male and female organism; which builds up from the identical substances a male or a female organism while subordinating all the organs and functions of the whole body to the principle which differentiates the male from the female? In vain does the advocate of a materialistic biology seek to lift the Iris veil to find the cause of life. Christians are satisfied to know that in the Holy of Holies of Nature God waves his omnipotent hand with life resulting throughout nature's domain. Faith worships where the skeptic eye sees nothing.

The even more recondite and fruitful study of psychology may be expected to furnish evidence against a materialistic philosophy. The operations of the mind should appear to the very sciolist so complex and vast, so utterly

superior to mere material forces as to enable him to conclude not only the existence of a vital energy, but also the spiritual nature of man; but the advocate of monism calmly asserts that mind is merely a function of the brain, instead of the brain being the organ of the mind. A German naturalist has not hesitated to declare that thought bears the same relation to the brain as urine to the kidneys and bile to the liver. The secret of higher and lower mentality is supposed to be found in the form of the skull, the relative weight of the brain and the number of its involutions or folds. According to this philosophy every mental process, in fact every act is the exclusive result of molecular motion in the brain. Psychologists of this stamp have laughingly undertaken to prove that the soul can be cut away layer by layer, as layer by layer of the brain is removed. Ruthlessly the very deduction has been drawn that the criminal is merely the victim of an abnormal chemical mixture in his cranium. A little more or less phosphor may make all the difference between the parricide Brutus and Beethoven, the Jupiter Tonans in the realm of music. We will not enter upon the anatomical and pathological aspects of this question as counter arguments against such vaporings of a pseudo-science lie upon the surface. All that anatomy and pathology can demonstrate is that the mind ordinarily uses the brain as its organ. We say advisedly: ordinarily. For the phenomena of dream life and of telepathy amply demonstrate the existence of spiritual forces independent of their material organs. That the mind is separate from and superior to the organ which it controls, is substantiated by the following facts:

The brain of a healthy child is perfect in form and relative size. If the phenomena of mind: perception, thought, will, these incentives to action, are the spontaneous outflow of mere molecular motion in the brain, the child should exhibit a far greater variety of mental processes and physical activities. Yet the child's mental attitude upon its entry into the world is almost altogether one of receptivity. But in a surprisingly brief period the child betrays an abundance of

mental power and possession which is altogether out of keeping with the limited growth of the brain during the same period.

Moreover, if the quality and amount of mental activity is dependent upon the weight and structure of the brain, how comes it that instances have occurred, when one lobe of the brain was removed by disease or by the knife of the physician without in the least disturbing or preventing the ordinary functions of the mind?

But, if thought is merely a chemical process in the brain, a stupendous riddle remains to be solved. What the substance of the brain is, any chemist can determine. That the food which we eat, replenishes and enriches the substance of the brain is beyond dispute. Every dipsomaniac proves the direct relation between the stomach and the brain. If mind, then, as our modern philosophers claim, is mere motion of matter, the enrichment of mind should be secured by careful alimentation. In that case the physician should introduce such phosphates and salts into the brain as will produce easy and prolific molecular action. The premises of the monists being granted, we should expect the greatest mental force from the well-fed patron of Delmonico's, or from the symmetrical frame of the savage. But it is most unkind for a Luther to have produced from an anaemic brain the world's best theology, for a dyspeptic Carlyle to have built out of English words the most glittering palace, for a poverty-stricken Schiller to have sung the world's greatest lyric; for genius to find the epicurean table uncongenial and to soar highest when shackled by want. For all these things prove that only *thought* enriches the mind and that mind can not be a material entity. It is gratifying that honest science will eventually always furnish the antidote for the poison produced by misleading experiments. That moral obliquity is the fruit of a peculiarity of the physical organism, is a natural deduction from monistic principles. But Dr. Spitzka declared at a recent scientific congress: "Many criminals show not a single anomaly in their physical or mental make-up, while many persons with marked evi-

dences of morphological aberration have never exhibited the criminal tendency. Every attempt to prove crime to be due to a constitution peculiar only to criminals has failed signally."

And so it must! Physico-chemical reactions doubtless occur when the brain bends to the dictates of mind, its mistress. But no materialistic psychology can explain the mystery of the real ego which perceives through the senses, thinks the thoughts of God after Him through its discursive faculties and by the very ability to spurn the truth which it has gathered, establishes the existence of something forever inexplicable by chemical processes, *the will.* Free from compulsion of material forces as is the will, it is yet a slave to an immaterial disease, sin. Monistic philosophy can not explain this phenomenon, in fact does not recognize it, and, thereby, establishes its incompetence to supply us with a true philosophy of life.

The materialistic psychology of the age prepares us for an anthropology which well deserves the epithet bestial. The evolutionist still champions his cause in the arena of thought. While a science which adopts the Biblical postulates concerning ultimate causes, contemplates man as created in the divine image, a monistic anthropology deals with man as the offspring of the beast. While man is a spiritual being endowed with gifts and potencies which place him next to God in the scale of life, moden science contends that he is only relatively above the animal, but essentially and fundamentally of the same order of beings. Nor can the monistic philosopher entertain a different view, as long as Darwin and Lamarque control the perspective with their doctrine of man's descent from the animal.

It is boldly stated that the savage negro stands nearer to the ape than to the mentally developed European and that thus the transition from animal to man is no more abrupt than that from plant to animal. Mere physiological and anatomical arguments are strong enough to show the flimsy character of the materialistic philosophy already. The pagan writer Salustius was struck by man's evident superi-

ority; his upright walk, his flashing eye, his soaring intellect. The structure of the human foot, the formation of his brain, his finer nervous fiber plainly indicate that the genus humanum is not a species of beast.

What man's physical structure teaches, is corroborated by his mental, spiritual and religious faculties, o fwhich the animal is hopelessly devoid, but which inhere in the most degraded human being.

The tremendous difference between man and animal consists in this, that the animal body of the human being is so organized as to serve his spiritual and intellectual interests, while the intellectual powers of the animal are so meagre as to serve merely the functions of its body. The animal is prompted in its actions chiefly by the desire of self-preservation. Phenomena and events which do not meet this desire, do not interest the animal. The child, however, at the earliest period of its history is wrought upon by innumerable impressions. What is mere curiosity in the animal, is in the child desire of knowledge. Man investigates the causes of things. His very mental organization makes him a seeker after truth. The number of perceptions streaming in upon the mind of the child is transmuted into wealth of thought. Such powers and desires show that man is not the hapless victim of physical forces, but their lord and master.

The intellectual activity of the animal is merely receptive, but that of man productive and creative. Man's power of forming conceptions and abstractions lifts him by an infinite remove above the animal. The intellect of the animal is too limited to render possible a mental assimilation of the phenomena it observes. Man's intellect, however, rises from the perception of phenomena to a realization of their essence. He generalises, he classifies. He abstracts from the objects and events which he observes their essential attributes and thus abstractions and conceptions are formed. The animal can not classify events under the category of cause and effect, except that it can be trained to believe that a certain effect will always follow a certain cause in point

of time. An animal may leap to its cave when it sees the lightning-flash cleave the sky, because experience will teach it that the terrifying thunder-peal will soon follow. Man's intellect enables him to differentiate between "post hoc" and "propter hoc." He can be taught to comprehend that light and sound are simultaneous, but do not reach the senses simultaneously because light and sound do not travel with the same swiftness.

Whatever reasoning is to be observed in the animal, is crudely *a priori,* while man's intellect scrutinizes the remotest causes to explain his observations. His *a posteriori* reasoning is the hall-mark of a *productive* intellect.

The animal is hopelessly and totally a stranger to the region of ethics and æsthetics. Its intellect not being capable of forming conceptions does not enable it to comprehend in any way and to any degree whatever the good, the true, the beautiful, while there is no race of men that does not possess, however crudely, the faculty for cultivating these blessings.

The demarcation line between man and animal becomes still clearer and broader when we reflect on the meaning of the gift of language. At least some animals possess the organs necessary to the production of speech; why can they not speak? This disability results from the disability to form conceptions. Man can make his observations his permanent possession only by letting them pass through an intellectual process of assimilation. But thought would be quite evanescent and undefined, if it did not clothe itself in symbols of permanent value. Such symbols are the words. As they retain their accepted significance the same combinations must always have the same meaning. Thus man is enabled to make his intellect the store-room of knowledge, and to communicate his knowledge to others through his unique, godlike power of language. The animal can not speak, because it has no mental possessions to communicate.

Man's power of forming conceptions, of which the faculty of articulate speech is a corollary, denotes that his intellect is productive, whereas that of the animal is altogether

receptive. But man's intellect is even absolutely creative. Man a higher animal indeed! Should his creative ideas be the result of mere molecular motion resultant from impressions produced upon the senses? The discovery of the elemental, impalpable forces of nature, such as gravity, magnetism, electricity, the imagery of Browning, the creations of Shakespeare should be explicable by physico-chemical reactions in the brain called forth by sense-impressions?

The attempt has been made to explain that the falling apple observed by Newton sufficiently explains the discovery of the law of gravitation. Indeed! Then some wise philosopher should explain, why the observation of the same phenomenon, viz., the falling apple, should lead to the discovery of the laws of gravitation in one brain, while it produces in an other the abstruse thought of pie, in still another that of apple-jack, in still another that of colic. May the disciple of Lamarque and Darwin adduce ever so specious arguments to show that man is only a beast on an ascending scale, the very intellectual processes necessary to give his school a semblance of scientific justification mark such would-be descendant of the beast as a master of creation, albeit incompetent and unfaithful. The massive marvels of the pyramids and the beauties of Greece, Homer's epics and Byron's passionate effusions, Mozart's symphonies and Demosthenes' orations, the towering battleship and the time-annihilating telegraph — all these and a myriad others declare man's nature to image not the grovelling condition of the beast, but the creative mind of God

The claim that there are human races and individuals bearing resemblance to the ape rather than to the most highly-developed members of the human family may have a semblance of evidence in its favor, but if all other differences were ignored, the capacity of man for knowing God places him in a category by himself. The most intelligent animal is inaccessible to the advantages of religion; the most degraded and unprogressive race, however, enters upon a process of infinite development the moment it receives the Gospel.

We do not claim that the knowledge of God is an element of man's consciousness. But the distinctive organization of man is such as to place faith within the pale of his attainments if he uses his powers aright. Reason is a faculty of the human soul. Obeying the law of its nature it will search for the cause of the things it observes. No cause, however, within its ken can satisfactorily explain the ultimate cause of all things. Unaided, it can not know God. It can not take the leap from the finite to the infinite, from that which is conditioned to the absolute, from the temporal to the eternal. But when God *reveals* saving truth, reason is able to apprehend and assimilate it as any other truth and thus to make faith possible.

Feeling is the faculty of the soul for perceiving pleasure and pain. This faculty, as long as God remains a stranger to man makes him a prisoner to discontent. Wealth, wisdom, joy leave the soul unsatisfied. "The ungodly have no peace." But, when God has placed His forgiving, satisfying grace within the scope of the human sensibilities, that peace results which passes understanding and which poverty can not starve nor flames burn away.

But man is not bound to be swayed by the cognitions of reason and the perceptions of his feelings. The needs of which man through reason and feeling becomes cognizant, work as impulses upon the will. He can, in fatal determination, defy both reason and feeling, but only to show that he comes under the authority of a law which is within him and yet above him: conscience. This, as the central religious organ, absolutely differentiates the lowest man from the highest animal. We think of conscience not as a faculty separate from and additional to reason, will and feeling, but as a law which assigns to all three moral value and religious responsibility, which dispenses approval for right use, chastening rebuke for misuse. Through conscience man becomes cognizant of a higher law engrafted upon his nature. It does not establish its own standard of right, but holds up as norm for man's total activity, as far as it is influenced by self-determination, the moral

standard which he has recognized. When the claims of the revelation of Jesus Christ stand at the bar of the will, conscience does its work by approving or disapproving its decision.

It may be fancied that the existence of conscience is the despair of the evolutionist. Plainly, that at least can not be traced back to the premordial protoplasm! Yet, the unblushing attempt is made to do it! Evolutionists declare it to be merely the reflection of education, political laws and the conventions of society. But a John Huss, a Luther, rising against the educational tenets, the laws and conventions of society until education, the conventions of society and the laws of the land assume more liberal forms and espouse more salutary ends, not only fail to vindicate, but absolutely confute a materialistic definition of conscience.

We have given no exhaustive, barely a kaleidoscopic survey of science. But whichever field we take up for examination, we find that monistic philosophy fails to explain the most obvious facts of life. Such a science can not explain sin as guilt, but only an imperfect development; has no food to offer to man's craving for immortality, no bulwarks to erect against the serried host of vice assailing our civilization from every standpoint. Such a philosophy has no more moral power than an amorous poetry of Ovid or the cold philosophy of Plato. With such philosophy in lieu of truth the old pagan ditty has the justification of common sense:

"Balnea, vina, Venus corrumpunt corpora nostra
Sed faciunt vitam balnea, vina, Venus."

Such a philosophy leaves unexplained the ultimate origin, the final destiny of man. Its religion is *Weltschmerz:*

"This is the sigh, that echoes through the wilderness of earth,
With its song and sorrow, day and death and birth: Why?
"It is the new-born infant's wail with all its life to face,
Man's last despairing sorrow as he passes into space: Why?"

STUDIES IN VEDIC RELIGION.

BY REV. ERNEST SCHULTZ,* KANSAS CITY, MO.

When master minds, giants in the sphere of thought, sojourn among men, they leave a lasting impression and definite influence not only upon their contemporaries but upon posterity as well. What they have thought and said is propagated by word and writing among future generations and thus their spirit lives on.

As a rule, every religion has passed through three evolutionary stages. First the powerful personality of the founder; then the following gathered around him; and thirdly, the documentary remains of what the founder was and did. Documents or literary fountains these writings are called, because they give us an authentic record of what the first disciples heard and saw; and whoever desires to acquaint himself with the Founder of any religion must dip at these sources.

Literary treasures, clothed in ancient, venerable language; wonderful books written on palm leaves, requiring years of patient study and research by the student of comparative religion; marvelous literary compilations, which, through centuries and even milleniums, have stood like imperishable rocks in the surging ocean of peoples; generation after generation believed in them and perished, but they remained unchanged; books loved, revered, worshipped by hundreds of millions yet known by a few: these are the Vedas.

Many centuries before the birth of Christ, about the time when the documents of the Old Testament were written among the Jews, the chosen People of God, the Rischis in India, reflecting the religious thought of the ancient Aryans, composed and sang hymns to the honor of God Brumha. When with solemn and measured steps they walked around their sacrificial altars, when looking up to the eternal Nackchatramulu (star gods), Chendrudu, (moon

* Formerly missionary in India.

god), and Suryudu (sun god), pondering over the first cause of existence, they broke forth in those ancient chants, probably the oldest in existence:

1. There was then neither what is not what is not,
There was no sky, nor the heaven which is beyond.
What covered?
Where was it and in whose shelter?
Was the water the deep abyss in which it lay?

2. There was no death, hence was there nothing immortal.
There was no light, distinction between night and day.
*That One** breathed by itself without breath,
Other than it there has been nothing.

3. Darkness there was, in the beginning
All this was a sea without light;
The gems that lay covered by the husk,
That One was born by power of heat.

4. Love overcame it in the beginning,
Which was the seed springing from mind;
Poets having searched in their heart found by wisdom
The bond of what is in what is not.

5. Their ray which was stretched across,
Was it below or was it above?
There were seedbearers there were powers,
Self power below, and will above.

6. Who then knows, who has declared it here,
From whence was born this creation?
The gods came later than this creation,
Who then knows whence it arose?

* Om! The One! The sacred word meaning God, used at the beginning of every religious prayer, song or incantation.

7. He from whom this creation arose,
Whether he made it or did not make it,
The *Highest Seer* in the highest heaven,
He forsooth knows; or does even he not know?
Rig Veda X, 129 I.

A grand and beautiful specimen of ancient philosophic poetry, yet how sad is the concluding result! They searched for the Deity and the origin of all existence, but they cannot rise above the question. And this is the essence of the whole Vedic literature, a searching but not finding.

Whatever now the ancient Rishis prayed and sang has come upon us in four distinct volumes called the Four Vedas named

1. Rig Veda,
2. Yayur Veda,
3. Sama Veda.
4. Atharva Veda.

These four books form the first class of Hindu sacred literature and are called *Sruti*, which means hearing or direct revelation.

The second class called *Smriti,* recollections, include the Brahmanas, Aranyakas, Upanishads and Sutras, which are admitted to have been composed by human authors and are commentaries of the Vedas of similar value, as the Talmud, Mishna, Gemarrah and Kabbala to the Old Testament. In the first class, the Sruti, according to Hindu theologians, not a single line was the work of human authors. The whole Veda is in some way or another the work of the Deity, and even those who received the revelation, or as they express it, those who saw it, were not supposed to be ordinary mortals, but beings raised above the level of common humanity. Their inspiration is regarded as so self-convincing as to require no proof, and entirely beyond the province of reason and argument. But although the Vedas are held in the highest estimation by the Hindu, their real character is almost entirely unknown to them. Very few

copies of them existed until they were printed in Europe. The Hindus study the commentaries, the Smriti, instead of the Sruti. "When Ramohun Row (Rao) was in London," says Max Mueller, "he saw at the British Museum a young German savant Fr. Rosen, busily engaged in copying manuscripts of the Rig Veda. The Rajah was surprised and told Rosen, that he ought not to waste his time copying the hymns, but that he should study the text of the Upanishads."

The following is a list of the Smriti which comprehends all post-Vedic literature under 4 heads.

I. The six Vedangas viz.:

(1.) Liksha, the science of pronounciation; (2) Chandas, metre; (3) Vyakarana, grammar; (4) Nirukti, explanation of Vedic words; (5) Iyotisha, astronomy; (6) Kalpa, ceremonial, including Sranta-Sutras, rules for applying the Mantras (incantations) and Brahmanas to Vedic sacrifices; Grya-Sutras, rules relating to domestic rights; Lamaya-Charika Sutras, rules relating to conventional usages; the last two are called Smarta-Sutras.

II. The Darsanas, systems of philosophy.

III. The 19 Dharma Sutras.

IV. The Stihasas, viz.: the two epic poems, the Mahabharata and Ramáyana; the eighteen Puranas which compose the ancient legendary lore.

The most interesting study in this vast mass of literature is no doubt the study of the Rig-Veda, which is as Max Mueller says "the Veda *par excellence*, containing the real theogony of the Hindus." It is divided (1) into 10 mandalas (books), containing 1017 metrical hymns (suktas), arranged according to their authors, and the gods to whom they are addressed; and (2) into eight ashtakas (eights) nearly equal in length, each of which is subdivided into as many adhyayas (lectures), and each of these again into almost thirty-three vargas (sections), usually containing five verses:

The hymns are composed in various metres, to the proper use of which great importance is attached because life and death, wealth and posterity are depending on it.

The Gayatri metre, which consists of three times eight syllables, is the most sacred and is the proper metre for Agni (god of fire) chaplain of the gods. It expresses the idea of Brumha: therefore the sacrificer must use it when he wishes anything closely connected with Brumha, such as acquirement of sacred knowledge and the thorough understanding of all problems of theology.

The Gayatri:
Om!
Tat Savitru varenyam Chargo devasya dhimohi |
dhiyo yo nah praihodayát
R. V. III Mandalah 62, 10
"May we attain that excellent glory of Savitar the god:
So may he stimulate our prayers."

The first hymn of the first Mandalah, composed by Madhuchchandas Visvamitra a son of Visvamitra and addressed to Agni is composed in the Gayatri metre and reads as follows:

1. "Om! Agnimīle purōhitain yajñasya dēvamtrviyian |
Hōtārain ratnadhātamain.
2. Agnih pūrvēbhi rrsibhiridyo nutanairuta |
Sa dēvāin eha vaksati ||
3. Agninā vayimasnavatposamēva divēdivē |
Yasasain viravattamam ||
4. Agnē yam yajnamadhvaram visvatah paribhurasi |
Sa iddēvēsu gachatti ||.

1. I laud Agni, the great highpriest, god, minister of sacrifice,
The herald lavishest of wealth.
2. Worthy is Agni to be praised by ancient as by living seers:
He shall bring hitherward the gods.

3. Through Agni man obtaineth wealth, yea, plenty, waxing day by day
Most rich in heroes glorious.

4. Agni, the flawless sacrifice, which thou compassest about
Verily goeth to the gods, etc., etc.

The second hymn addressed to Vayu (wind god), and Indra (cloud or rain god) is an invitation to a Bacchanalian feast:

1. Beautiful Vayu come, for thee these Soma* drops have been prepared:
Drink of them hearken to our call.

2. Knowing the days, with Soma juice poured forth, the singers call to thee
O Vayu, with their hymns of praise.

3. Vayu, thy penetrating voice goes forth unto the worshipper,
Far-spreading for the Soma drink.

4. Here, Indra Vayu, is the juice; come for our offered dainties sake:
The drops are yearning for you both.

5. Vayu and Indra, well ye know libations, rich in sacred rites!
So come ye hither rapidly.

6. Vayu and Indra, some to what the Somapresser has prepared:
Soon, heroes, even with resolve.

7. Mitra, of holy strength, I call, and foe-destroying Varuna,
Who make the oil-fed rite complete.

8. Mitra and Varuna, through law, lovers and cherishers of law,
Have you obtained your mighty powers.

*Soma is a very intoxicating concoction of the juice of the Soma plant.

9. Our sages, Mitra-Varuna, of wide dominion strong by birth,
Vouchsafe us strength that worketh well.

HYMN 25 TO VARNA.

This hymn was addressed by Sunahsepa* to Varuna when bound as a purushamedha (human sacrifice) to the sacrificial post.

1. Whatever law of thine, O god, O Varuna, as we are men
Day after day we violate.

2. Give us not as a prey to death, to be destroyed by thee in wrath,
To thy fierce anger when displeased.

---

* The subject has been carefully investigated by Dr. Rajendralala Mitra the most distinguished Indian scholar, of modern times, in a paper originally published in the Journal of the Asiatic Soc. of Bengal. Some maintain that human sacrifices are not authorized in the Vedas, but were introduced in later times. Dr. R. Mitra says: "As a Hindoo writing on the actions of my forefathers — remote as they are — it would have been a source of great satisfaction to me if I could adopt this conclusion as true; but I regret I cannot do so consistently with my allegiance to the cause of history." He adds further: "Benign and humane as was the spirit of the ancient Hindoo religion, it was not opposed to animal sacrifice; on the contrary, most of the principal rites required the immolation of large numbers of various kinds of beasts and birds. One of the rites enjoined required the performer to walk deliberately into the depth of the ocean to drown himself. This was called Mahaprasthana, and is forbidden in the present age. Another, an expiatory one, required the sinner to burn himself to death, on a blazing pyre — the Tushanala. This has not yet been forbidden. The gentlest of beings, the simple-minded women of Bengal, were for a long time in the habit of consigning their first born babes to the sacred river Ganges at Sagar Island, and this was preceded by a religious ceremony, though it was not authorized by any of the ancient rituals." But to turn from presumptive evidence to the facts recorded in the Vedas. The earliest reference to human sacrifice occurs in the first Mandala of the Rig Veda. It contains seven hymns supposed

3. To gain thy mercy, Varuna, with hymns we bind thy heart, as binds
The chariot'eer his tethered horse.

4. They flee from me dispirited, bent only on obtaining wealth,
As to their nests the birds of air.

5. When shall we bring, to be appeased the hero, lord of warrior mighty,
Aim the farseeing Varuna?

6. This, this with joy, they both accept in common: never do they fail the faithful worshipper, etc., etc.

13. Varuna wearing golden mail, has clad him in a shining robe:
His spies are seated round about.

---

to have been by one Sunahsepa where he was bound to a post preparatory to being immolated. The story is given in the Aitareya Brahamana of the Rig Veda:

"Harichandra had made a vow to sacrifice his first born to Varuna, if that deity would bless him with children. A child was born named Rohita, and Varuna claimed it; but the father evaded fulfilling his promise under various pretexts until Rohita, grown up to man's estate, ran away from home, when Varuna afflicted the father with dropsy. At last Rohita purchased one Sunahsepa from his father Ajigarta for a hundred cows. When Sunahsepa had been prepared, they found nobody to bind him to the sacrificial post. Then Ajigarta said, 'Give me another hundred, and I shall bind him;' they gave him another 100 cows and he bound him. When Sunahsepa had been prepared and bound, when the Apri hymns had been sun, and he had been led around the fire, they found nobody to kill him. Next Ajigarta said: 'Give me another hundred and I shall kill him.' They gave him another hundred cows, and he came whetting his knife. Sunahsepa then recited the hymns praising Agni, Indra, Mitra, Varuna, and other gods he says:—

13. "Bound to three pillars, captured Sunahsepa thus to the Aditya made his supplication.

Him may the sovereign Varuna deliver, wise ne'er deceived, loosen the bonds that bind him. I, 24.

Varuna pleased with the hymns of Sunahsepa set him free."

14. The god whom enemies threaten not, nor those who tyrannize over men
Nor those whose minds are bent on wrong.

15. He who gives glory to mankind, not glory that is incomplete,
To our own bodies giving it.

16. Yearning for the wideseeing one, my thoughts move onward to him,
As kine unto their pasture move.

17. Once more together let us speak, because thy meath† is brought:
Priestlike thou eatest what is dear to thee.

18. Now saw I him, whom all may see, I saw his car above the earth.
He hath accepted these my songs.

19. Varuna hear this call of mine; be gracious unto us this day:
Longing for help I cried to thee.

21. Thou, O wise God, art Lord of all, thou art king of earth and heaven:
Hear, as thou goest on thy way.

22. Release us from the upper bond, untie the bond between and loose
The bonds below that I may live."

These few extracts from the Rig Veda may suffice, as they give the kind reader an idea of their poetic style and literary value. The Yajur Veda consists principally of prayers used for the consecration of utensils and material of sacrificial worship. It has about half the number of hymns, partly taken from the Rig Veda and is divided into the white (sukla) and black (krishma).

† The Soma Veda is only one-fourth the size of the Rig and almost entirely taken from it. Hence Max Müller says: "These mead — as sweet liquor.

Two Vedas, the Yajur and Soma Veda, were, in truth, what they are called in the Kaushitaki Brahmana, the attendants of the Rig Veda."

The Atharva Veda is nearly as large as the Rig but the two have little in common as to their contents. It teaches mainly how to appease the angry Gods, how to bless, curse, and how to correct what has been wrongly done in the act of a sacrifice.

"Each Veda is divided into Mantras and Brahmanas. The mantras are a collection of hymns in which the praises of the gods are sung and their blessings invoked. The Brahmanas are treatises written in prose for the use of the Brahmans, and contain both the liturgical institutes, in which the ceremonial application of the hymns is prescribed, and the Aranyakas* and Upanishads, or the theological disquisitions in which the spiritual aspirations gradually developed in the minds of the more devout of the Indian sages, find expression. It is evident, therefore, that the hymns are the original and most essential portions of the Vedas; that the Brahmanas rose out of the hymns, and are subservient to their employment for the purpose of worship; while the Upmishads give expression to speculative ideas of a spiritual and mystical character, which, though discernable in the Koran of the Mohammedans the hymns abound in further developed and systematized in these later treatises."

The general style and character of Vedic Literature however must not be judged from the few quotations given, for though the hymns consist of metrical verses, the reader painfully misses lofty conceptions and striking thoughts expressed in chaste measured language. Very much like unto the Koran of the Mohammedans, the hymns abound in tedious repetitions and childish ideas, which form a great contrast to the easy flow and elevated conceptions of the sacred poetry of the Hebrews. Only here and there a lofty thought like a sparkling jewel in a rubbish pile may be found. I cannot describe them better than in the words of Max

* Rules for monastic orders or forest dwellers and hermits.

Müller: "The general character of these works (Brahmanas) is marked by shallow and insipid grandiloquence, by priestly conceits and antiquarian pedantry." "These works deserve to be studied as the physician studies the twaddle of idiots and the ravings of madmen. They will disclose to a thoughtful eye the ruins of faded grandeur; the memories of noble aspirations. But let us only try to translate these works into our own language, and we shall feel astonished that human language and human thought should ever have been used for such purpose." Hist. Anc. Laws, Lit. p. 389.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES CONCERNING ORIGINAL SIN.

BY REV. A. F. ROHR, A. M., SHIPPENVILLE, PA.

II.

THESIS IV.

Having reference to the manner in which we are held accountable for the mal-administration of our representative.

The Scriptures teach us that this sin descends from Adam to his posterity, and is imputed to them for guilt and punishment.

Even as there have been in times past, so there are many to-day who hold and teach that the sin of our first parents and its punishment belonged to them alone. They are ready to admit that our first parents transgressed the command of their Creator, and were by Him ustly punished for their transgression, and that in some respects, their sin, or rather the penalty for their sin, may have affected the condition of their descendants in this world; but they will not for a moment admit, but on the contrary deny, yea, they scoff at the idea of this sin being transmitted and imputed to the posterity of Adam. They seem

almost to regard as a fool or a lunatic one who holds and teaches that infants and little children are sinners, and by nature outcasts from God. In utter scorn many cast aside the whole doctrine of original sin, and declare in their wisdom of self-conceit, that there is no such a thing as regards us, that the whole doctrine concerning it is only an ecclesiastical bug-bear. They hold and teach that man is born sinless, and becomes a sinner only when and as he sins; that man is not by nature spiritually dead, but is and can be, as he wills, in union and full communion with God, and pleasing in His sight; that bodily death is natural, and would have existed as now even if our first parents had not fallen into sin; and as regards eternal death, while many reject it altogether, others say that it depends wholly on man himself who, as a free, moral agent, can either serve God and live, or not serve Him and die. Such views, however, are not consonant with the teachings of the Scriptures, but are the views of those who, because of this very sin in their hearts, say, that the Bible is not the Word of God, but only contains the Word of God, scattered through a lot of rubbish like a few grains of wheat scattered through a large pile of chaff. But for us who hold fast the whole teaching of the whole Scriptures, the doctrine of original sin is an important doctrine, not to be dealt with or passed over lightly. We realize that its elimination would turn the whole teaching of the orthodox Church, past and present, topsy turvy, and convert the whole Word of God into a lie. We believe not only in the existence of this sin as taught in the Scriptures, but also, in the light of these, recognize it as it manifests itself in the sinful disposition and ungodly deeds of the natural man.

According to the flesh we are the legitimate heirs of our first father, Adam, and as such we have and inherit what he had; and what he lost of the original estate was also our loss; hence, when he lost the image of God, we also lost it as a part of the family estate. In Adam, as the representative of our whole race, when he lived, we lived;

when he died, we died; when he sinned and became guilty, we sinned and became guilty; and as this guilt brought punishment upon him, so also it brings punishment upon us. In his loins, in accord with the teachings of Scripture, we were; in him, as the representative of the whole human race, we all were bound up, our intellects in his intellect, and our wills in his will; in him, passively, so to speak, we thought, and in him we willed, and in him, when he put forth volition contrary to God's will, we also put forth such volition; hence, in him we sinned, and therefore, from him we have come forth with the stain of this sin and its guilt upon us; and because such is the case, God justly and rightly imputes it unto us. Of course, in Adam, in one sense of the word, in so far as he was an individual member of the race which he represented, his act in eating of the forbidden fruit was his own sin as an indivdual, and for it he was individually responsible — guilty and subject to punishment, and in this sense his sin is not nmputed unto us. The act itself was his as the active agent; we, though in him, were passive. The act of eating of the forbidden fruit in itself was original with Adam, but not with us. But although that act was Adam's sin as an individual, yet it, or rather that which prompted it, was the original orginator of what we know as original sin; that is, what we call original sin flowed from that act; but the act itself did not descend to us save by imputation. The disobedience represented by that act is ours. The act is called the active or originating original sin, while what we call original sin is originated or passive original sin. What we call original sin is not so called because the Scriptures speak of it by that name, but because it originated with Adam, the original of our race, because it was united with the origin of his descendants, and because it is the origin of all actual transgression. Quen. II; 115, and Holl. 518, see S. D. p. 263. "The first sin of Adam, since he is regarded as the common parent, head, root, and representative of the whole human race is truly and justly imputed by God for guilt and punishment to all his posterity." Holl. 513: S. D. p. 261.

"By the sin that is imputed to us is understood — Quen. II: III — the disobedience by which the first parents of the human race turned themselves away from God," etc. S. D. p. 261.

When righteousness and true holiness, the image of God, was lost, another image of a different order took its place, the image of unrighteousness and unholiness, the condition of sin. This had become Adam's condition or state when, Gen. 5:3, he begat a son in his own likeness and image. That such should be the case was only natural since everything produces after its kind; hence, in accord with natural law, Adam, of whom the pollution of sin had become a natural attribute, could produce only sin-polluted children. For him to have begotten children in the image of God, free from the stain of sin, would have been altogether unnatural. It would have been like producing peaches, pears, or some other sort of fruit from the buds or the life germs of the apple. This would have been absolutely impossible save by the intervention of supernatural grace. Here again some say, well, why did God not intervene with supernatural grace; and instead of permitting all the sin, woe, and misery, suffering and death to go forth for all time, and for the majority of mankind, for all eternity, permit Adam's children to be born sinless, and let Adam's sin die with Adam? Again, we would answer that He did not owe man supernatural grace, and that He did perfectly right in permitting the laws of nature which He Himself had made and fixed to take their course in this respect even as in others. He was in no sense of the word bound to interfere with the working of these laws, which in themselves were perfect even as their Maker, but rather, if it is permissible thus to speak, bound to uphold and preserve them. As regards the whys and the wherefores for the exercise or non-exercise of supernatural grace, what have we weak and sinful mortals to do with them? These whys and wherefores as well as the exercise itself of such grace are the prerogatives of Him who takes no counsel with His creatures, the great I Am, the same yesterday, to-day and forever. The fact before us is

this: that the changed condition of our first parent descends to his posterity, his sin is imputed unto them, and punishment for the same is exacted of them as such who are responsible for the doings of the representative through whom they act. Thus this sin and its consequences are ours in deed and in truth. In Adam we all sinned, Rom. 5:12; and in Adam we all die, 1 Cor. 15:22; death passed upon all men for that all have sinned, Rom. 5:12, even over infants and such as have not yet been born, who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, Rom. 5:14; through the offense of one many are dead, Rom. 5:15; judgment came by one to condemnation, Rom. 5:16; by one man's offense death reigned, Rom. 5:17; and by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, Rom. 5:18. "As we are made righteous by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, so were we made unrighteous by the disobedience of Adam." Quen. II: 113. S. D. p. 263. Adam became unrighetous, and therefore, "we are all an unclean thing and al lour righteousnesses are as filthy rags." Isa. 64:6. Adam, because of his sin became an object of wrath; and because of his sin, we, his descendants, "are by nature the children of wrath." Eph. 2:3. We are thus by nature in the same sad and forlorn condition as were our first parents, without righteousness, holiness, and communion with God. The punishment which fell upon them falls upon us olso. The death which passed upon them passed also upon us; we are dead spiritually — "dead in trespasses and sin," Eph. 2:1; we all die bodily,"We all do fade as a leaf, and our iniquities like the wind have taken us away," Isa. 64:6; and we are dead eternally, unless we be born again, "for ye must be born again," John 3:7; "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, John 3:6; man is dead outside of the kingdom of God, therefore, unless he "be born again of water and spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," John 3:5; yea, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." John 3:3. Thus the sin of Adam belongs also to his descendants; and because it is their lawful inheritance, it is with right also imputed unto them; and were it not rightfully theirs, where

would be the justice of God, who is perfectly just, holy, and righteous, in imputing this sin even to such as have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

Thesis V.

Having reference to the condition in which the loss of this estate left the family.

The Scriptures teach us that original sin is a complete corruption of man's whole nature, that he, having lost the image of God *is* spiritually dead; and alienated from and in rebellion against his Creator, he, with darkened understanding and perverted will, is continually prone only to that which is evil, and subject to punishment and condemnation.

In the preceding theses, we have seen that original sin is that sin which has been originated in us by the disobedience of our first parents in eating of the forbidden fruit. Esau sold his birthright for a mess of pottage; and by so doing, deprived not only himself, but also robbed his descendents of the advantages of that birthright; so also Adam sold our birthright for a mess, not of pottage, but of gangrening poison. Esau ate his dearly purchased pottage and was, no doubt, for the time being personally benefited thereby; Adam ate his poison mess, and the virus entered his whole being, completely ruining him and his posterity. As a consequence of his deed, Esau transmitted no birthright to his posterity; but Adam has transmitted to his descendants not only no birthright, but he has transmitted something else, namely, the blood-poisoning which he contracted by his sin. As this poison ruined him so aiso it has ruined them; the father's iniquity is visited on them as his children; and therefore, man finds himself utterly corrupted — all his faculties weakened, his appetities depraved, his will perverted and in rebellion against the will of God. This corruption is truly his. It fills his whole being, it flows through his veins like a fiery flood, it maddens him until he defies God, and plunges him into filth and impurity until, like an obscene animal, he delights only in obscene food. This in-

heritance of depravity in our nature is, by St. Paul, called, "The sin that dwelleth in me, Rom. 7:17; also, "The sin which doth so easily beset us," Heb. 12:1; also, "The law which is in my members, Rom. 7:23; also, he says, "I find then a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me." Rom. 7:21. And further, that the Scriptures clearly and distinctly teach the complete corruption of human nature in all mankind is evident from such passages as the following: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Gen. 6: 5; also, "And God looked upon the earth, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth," Gen. 6:12; also, "If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me; if I say that I am perfect, it shall also prove me perverse," Job 9:20; also, "If I wash myself with snow water, and make mine hands never so clean, yet shalt thou plunge me in the ditch, and mine own clothes shall abhor me," Job 9:30. 31; also, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one," Job 14:4; also, "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good; no, not one," Ps. 14: 2. 3; also, Ps. 58:3; Ps. 51:5; Ps. 94:11; Ps. 13:3; Ps. 148:2; Isa. 53:6; Ps. 48:8; John 3:5. 6; Rom. 3:23; Rom. 6:26; Rom. 5:12. 13. 14; Gen. 5:3; 1 John 1: 8. 10, etc., etc.

There is no neutral territory between the service of God and the service of the devil, for "ye cannot serve God and Mammon," Matt. 6:24, and "he that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad," Matt. 12:30. Thus he who is not with God is against Him; and he who is not righteous is unrighteous or corrupt; and he who has not original righteousness must necessarily have original corruption. Not having original righteousness, we necessarily have something else, its contrary, original corruption in its stead. It is either with or against God, and where the one condition does not exist,

the other necessarily must. Hence as the Scriptures teach us, in the fall, not only did righteousness depart from man, but its very departure left him its contrary. Man not only lost something, but he also received something. Hence we speak of original sin not only as the absence of original righteousness, but the absence of such righteousness connected with the depravity which the loss of that righteousness entailed. It is not only the want of original righteousness — Ps. 14:3, and Ps. 53:23 — but also the possession of unrighteousness; that is, a complete corruption of our whole nature — Rom. 7:17, 20, 21 — which has become ours through the fall.

Spiritual death, upon which followed bodily and eternal death, was, or rather, is the result of the loss of God's image. On the loss of this man's powers ceased to act in conformity with God's will; harmony and communion between the creature and the Creator being broken, man stood naturally opposed to and in rebellion against God, and consequently, became by nature an object of wrath. Eph. 2:3. The spiritual faculties of man ceasing to do that which is spiritually good converted man into a corpse spiritually or, if the expression be permissible into a spiritual corpse. Just as little as a dead body can act of its own power, just so little can the spiritually dead of their own power be active in the domain of the spiritual, in the doing of that which is good; hence, all the attempts of the natural man, even with the very best intentions of which he is capable, to do good, amount to no more than the worthless motions of a galvanized corpse, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin, Rom. 14:23; and without faith it is impossible to please Him" (God), Heb. 11:16; and "They that are in the flesh cannot please God," Rom. 8:8.

But while, in one sense of the word, the spiritual faculties of man are very much dead, in another sense, they are very much alive. They are essentially vital faculties, and have not been destroyed by the fall; but their activity has been turned in another direction. While they are naturally dead and inactive as regards that which is good, they are

naturally alive and active as regards that which is evil. The understanding, which is darkened as regards things spiritual, is active and busy in the domain of wickedness; the perverted will, which is bound as regards that which is good, acts with perfect freedom in the province of evil; and the depraved appetites and desires, no longer under the control of the higher faculties, lead man captive at will. Hence, in accord with the Scriptures, we hold and teach that original sin is not merely the want of righteousness, but also a depraved concupiscense; and therefore, the doctrine of original sin negative and positive; "negative, without the good which should exist; positive, desirous of the evil which should not exist i. e., concupiscence itself" —see S. D. pp. 265-266 — which is the proneness to sin existing in man by nature. As regards the darkness of man's understanding, perversion of will, etc., it is needless to multiply quotations from the Scriptures, hence the following must suffice. In John 3:6, we are told: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh;" in Eph. 2:1: "you who are dead in trespasses and sins"; in 1 Cor. 2:14: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned;" in Eph. 4:18: "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart; in 2 Cor. 3:5: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves"; in Rom. 8:7, 8: "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So they that are in the flesh cannot please God"; also, John 3:3; Job 11:12; Job 28:12, 13, 20, 21; Job 21:14; Ps. 82:5; etc. As regards the proneness of man to that which is evil, see further, Rom. 1:29-32; Rom. 3:10-18; Eph. 2:3; Eph. 4:19; 2 Tim. 3:2-7; Tit. 1:15; 2 Pet. 2:13, 14, 19; Jude 12, 13; etc.

This inheritance from our first parents, belonging to all mankind begotten in the natural way, this want of faith and fear of God is real sin existing within us bringing eter-

nal punishment and condemnation unto all who are not born again, as we hold and teach, Aug. Conf. Art. 2. "Through the fall of our first parents, man's nature and person has become a mass of corruption and sin in which is to be found nothing good and therefore must, unless cleansed and renewed, be subject to eternal condemnation before God in whose presence sin cannot abide. The wicked angels sinned, and after the stain of sin was upon them, could no longer abide in His presence, and just as little or less could we. As further proof that this corruption has real existence within us and is real sin see Rom. chap. 7, in which St. Paul makes repeated reference to it as such. Hence —

Thesis VI.

Having reference of the manner in which this condition exists in the members of our family.

The Scriptures teach us that this sin so permeates and inheres in man's nature as at present constituted as to be inseparable from it in his present state, except by the grace of God, and endures even in the regenerate to the dissolution of body and soul.

In 1 John 5:19, we read: "The whole world lieth in wickedness; and also in 1 John 3:10: "All that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life is not of the Father, but of the world." And to the whole human race may well be applied the words of Isaiah when he says, chap. 1:56: "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment." In speaking of those who are sinners, the Scriptures do not make exception of a single human being begotten in the natural way, but have included all under sin; and further declare that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. To each human being, of course, the God-man excepted, are applicable the words: "If we say that we have

no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us"; and also: "If we say that we have not sinned we make Him a liar and His word is not in us." 1 John 1:8, 10. "We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." Isa. 64:6. "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it." Jer. 17:9. All men are as an unclean thing; and their uncleanness pervades not only a part of, but their whole nature. In the heart this uncleanness and wickedness is found so closely ingrained — so much a part of it, that man of his own power, or with the aid of any other earthly power, is utterly unable to rid himself of its contaminating presence. That heart is a loathsome charnal house, the filth and iniquity of which may, in a measure, be hid from the eyes of men, but not from the all-penetrating eye of the omniscient God. Because of this inherent uncleanness, all men stand before God filthy, guilty, and condemned. And do what they will, unto each one are applicable the words of Jer. 2:22: "Though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God." In uncleanness — uncleanness pervading, corrupting, and polluting his whole nature, man goes his way naturally out of love for that which is evil, doing what is abominable in the sight of God. As natural as it is for swine to drink swill, so natural is it for man to do what is sinful because of the sinful condition of his nature. In 2 Peter 2:22, we read concerning such as had come to know the way of righteousness, but again, by following their evil inclinations, had gone back to their former state: "But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, the dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." In Rom. 7:15, St. Paul says: "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." If such was the case with a man like St. Paul where do we stand? Because of this uncleanness in man's nature, he can do nothing good. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed

to do evil." Jer. 13:23. Deeply indeed does this sin permeate, and inhere in man's whole nature. To avoid the erroneous idea of its being an accident or quality lightly or externally attached to man's nature, it is sometimes spoken of as belonging to his nature, yea, some (Flacius, for instance) have gone so far as to aver "that oroginal sin is the very substance itself of man or the human soul." But when we use the expression that this sin belongs to man's nature and expressions of a like order, we should always bear in mind what is said in the Formula of Concord, Dec. 1:51: "To avoid strife about words, equivocal terms i. e. words and expressions, which may be understood and used in several senses, should be carefully and distinctly explained, as when it is said: God creates the nature of men, where by the term 'nature' the essence, body and soul of men are understood. But often the disposition or vicious quality is called its nature, as: 'It is the nature of the serpent to bite and poison.' Thus Luther says that sin and to sin are the disposition and nature of the corrupt man." And thus if we say that this sin belongs to man's nature as at present constituted, we do not thereby mean that it belongs to the essence or substance of his nature; that is, that is is such a part of his nature as is essential to his existence. Man did exist without it when he came forth from the hand of his Creator and during the period of his life before the fall, and those who are saved will again exist without it in the kingdom of Heaven. In this sense although natural to man, something belonging to every human being, and predicable of all without exception, yet it is an accident. St. Paul, in Rom. 7:20, speaks of it as the "sin that dwelleth in me," which shows also that it does not belong to the substance of man's nature. Yet so intimate is this indwelling that it has changed the condition of man's whole nature. This sin, in itself, in the abstract, is nothing, has no existence. It is a condition which cannot be separated from man's nature, and have an existence of its own. Just as putrefaction cannot be separated from a piece

of putrefied flesh, so this corruption of sin cannot be separated from man's nature in his present state — save, of course, by the grace of Him with whom all things are possible. That putrefaction can have no existence outside of that piece of flesh; it is a condition, and in the abstract is nothing, but in the meat, in the concrete, it has an existence; it is something, so to speak; and its existence there makes the nature of that meat bad, yea, it belongs, in a sense, really and truly to its nature as bad meat; and so also this indwelling sin makes our nature bad, yea, in a sense, belongs truly to our nature as a bad nature.

This corruption is a fixed condition in our nature in this life; and unless removed by supernatural agency, as it is in those who are saved, also for eternity. Like leprosy — like blood-poisoning, it has infected and corrupted our whole nature so that there is no longer any soundness in our flesh. So to speak, it flows through every vein, it oozes out of every pore. Like decay-like rot, while only a condition, having no existence outside of us, that is, in the abstract, it has a horribly real existence within us. It is not a corruption of certain qualities or accidents of our nature only, but a most complete corruption of our whole nature. Quen. II:62. S. D. p. 267, says: "That it is not a mere *accident* lightly and externally attached, but internally and intimately inhering, and therefore called, Heb. 12:1, the easily besetting sin (εὐπερίστατος) that is an *accident* connate or, involved and natural; not indeed that it arises from the nature as such, but is produced together with it, or is connate with it; not that it is any temporary and transient accident, but fixed and permanent." Also Chem. Loci 1:259. S. D. p. 268: "The nature and substance in man since the fall and before regeneration is by no means upright, pure, and sound, but the very nature or substance of man, and especially the human soul, is truly corrupt, vitiated and depraved, and that not lightly or only superficially, or even in some part only; but the whole mass (if I may so speak) of the substance, or of human nature, and especially of the soul, is corrupted and vitiated with

the deepest depravity . . . This corruption of depravity is nothing abstract, nor an idea outside of the substance or nature of man, but is inherent in our very nature or substance, and like a spiritual poison has infected, pervaded, and diffused itself far and wide throughout all the members of our whole substance or human nature." Formula of Concord, Dec. 1:33: "Although original sin, like a spiritual poison or leprosy (as Luther says) has poisoned and corrupted all human nature, so that we cannot clearly show and point out the nature apart by itself, and original sin apart by itself; nevertheless, the *corrupt nature,* or essence of the corrupt man, body and soul, or the man himself whom God created (and within whom dwells the original sin that also corrupts the nature, essence, or entire man) and *original sin* which dwells in man's nature, or essence, and corrupts it are not one thing; as also in external leprosy the body which is lepros, and the leprosy on or in the body, are not, properly speaking, one thing. A distinction must also he observed between our nature, as God-created and preserved by God, and original sin, which dwells in the nature. These two must and also can be considered, taught, and believed with their distinctions according to Holy Scripture." See also Form. Conc. Dec. 1:57, etc.

This horrible condition, property, or accident, dwells in our nature, and because of its indwelling, we all are dead in trespasses and sin; and if we would again live we must be released from this condition of death. Each one of us may well exclaim with St. Paul: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Rom. 7:24. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." John 3:3. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3:5. Unto us also, in accord with the words of our Lord, comes the new birth by baptism—"by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he she on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Tit. 3:5-7. In re-

generation the guilt of this sin is taken away, but not the sin itself. Concupiscence still remains, working in our members in opposition to that which is good, and in accord with the will of God. But although the sin still remains, it is not imputed; for "we are not under the law but under grace" — Rom. 14:15 — and "sin is not imputed where there is no law." Rom. 5:13. But the old corrupt root of sin remains in our nature, just as does the original root of a grafted tree. The wild crab-apple is a rough, thorny tree, and bears a bitter, extremely acid, and in every way impalatable fruit; but when the scoins of good apples are grafted onto its root, a tree bearing good fruit is produced. But the good fruit is the product of that which has been grafted onto the root. The nature of the root remains unchanged, the same as it was before. It is still crab-apple; and if not watched and kept closely pruned, it will send up sprouts which as they grow will enable the root to assert its former dominion; for these sprouts will choke and eventually kill the graft, and will bear the natural fruit of the root. And so we also in regeneration become grafted trees in Christ; but the old root of sin still remains in our nature, ready at any time, yea, seeking to assert its former dominion, and to bring forth its vile fruit. Hence it is only by remaining in Christ that we, as grafted trees, can retain our new life, and bring forth good fruit. Yet at its best this fruit is not altogether good. Even as in a grafted crab-apple tree the original root more or less affects the quality of the fruit which grows upon the grafts, so also the old root of sin, more or less, affects our fruit as grafted trees. The regenerated man's very best, highest, and noblest deeds are, to a greater or less degree, tinged, affected and imperfect because of this sin, this old root which still exists within him. But by regeneration the dominion of the root is broken, and though the fruit is not perfect, yet it is good when compared with the fruit of its former state. By God's grace, new strength and power — new life is given, and "even so we should walk in newness of life." Rom. 6:4. It shall be with us even according to

the words of the apostle St. Paul when, in Rom. 6:22, he says: "But now being made free from sin, and become the servants of God, ye have your fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life." But as said, even though we be regenerated, the old root of sin still remains within us, and tinges, colors, and deforms our very best actions; and not only so, but frequently, in spite of our best endeavors, leads us to do that which is contrary to God's will; and we find that when we would do good, evil is present with us, and because of this evil being present with us, we cannot do the things that we would. With St. Paul, we are compelled to confess that in our flesh dwelleth no good thing. "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin." Prov. 9:20: "There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not." Eccl. 7:20. "The hearts of the sons of men are full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live." Eccl. 9:3. "Thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." Rom. 2:1. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Gal. 5:17. Further, see Rom. 7:14-25. "In original sin there are four things worthy of attention, to each of which a certain limit of duration has been prefixed. (1.) An inflammable material (fomes) habitually inhering in the root. (2.) A consciousness of this tendency or root. (3) The dominion of it; and finally (4.) Guilt. The *last* is removed in regeneration and justification; *dominion* in sanctification (not at once, but gradually and successively, because sanctification is not complete in this life); the consciousness is removed in death; the material itself not in the reducing to ashes (since not the body, but the soul, is the first and immediate object of sin), but in the dissolution of the soul and body." Quen. II:62. S. D. p. 270.

Thesis VII.

Having reference to the manner in which this condition is perpetuated in the family.

The Scriptures teach us that this sin is transmitted by parents to their children through natural generation.

In Adam, in his loins, according to the Scriptures, we were, in him we sinned, in him we died, and from him we have come forth as the corrupt fruit of a corrupt tree. As to when and how this sin is contracted by the soul, and how it is transmitted from generation to generation is a problem which has caused much speculation, and which, even in the light of the Scriptures, is surrounded by difficulties to the thinking mind, and has given rise to theories and beliefs of many sorts; and this because God, in His wisdom, has not seen fit to reveal everything concerning such process of transmission, and because man, in his presumptuousness, in this, as in other matters, will try with his finite mind to fathom the deep mysteries of his Creator. But in this, as in other provinces, the All-Wise has set us our boundaries beyond which we may not and cannot go; and what He has not revealed is none of our business, nor is it necessary for us to know what He has hidden in order to form a conception of the real facts in the case. What He has chosen to reveal plainly enough to us in the Scriptures, even though He does not tell us everything concerning the matter, should be, and also is sufficient for us who abide by the revealed word. And it is from the Scriptures that we gather that this sin is transmitted from the father with the soul in natural generation. Man is conceived in corruption, and he is brought forth in corruption. The sin-corrupted soul is simply the corrupt fruit of a corrupt tree, which, because of its very nature, cannot do otherwise than bring forth corrupt fruit. According to natural law, like begets like. Man is subject to natural law in this respect even as in others, and God permits this natural law, which He Himself has set fast, to take its course; and therefore it is that this corrupt human nature, from generation

to generation, continues to bring forth its corrupt fruit. God does not create sin in the soul — sin is not a creation, for in and by itself it is nothing — but the soul is sinful because it comes from a sinful source, even as a bitter fountain sends forth bitter water, not because the water is naturally bitter, but because the fountain itself is bitter. But all sorts of questions are asked by men. "Whence," they say, "comes the soul? when does it enter the body, at conception, at quickening, or at birth? Were all souls created during the period of creation, or is a new soul created for every human being born, and if so, does God create it with or without sin?" And thus foolish man, in the darkness of his understanding and blindness and perverseness of his heart, asks all sorts of foolish questions, in the answering of which, in most instances, if answered at all, the fool must be answered according to his folly.

The loins of Adam were corrupted and filled with a loathsome disease, the leprousy of sin, which disease descends from him, and after him from sire to son, so that each one of us must say with the Psalmist: "My loins (*Kesel* — flank) are filled with a loathsome disease, and there is no soundness in my flesh." Ps. 38:7. That man's offspring is represented as coming out of his loins, see Gen. 35:11; 1 Kings 8:19; 2 Chron. 6:9; Gen. 46:26; Exod. 1:15; Heb. 7:5; Heb. 7:10.

In Gen. 5:3, we read that Adam "begot a son in his own likeness, after his own image." This was not in the likeness and image of God in which he had been created, for that image had disappeared with his fall into sin, but the likeness and image which he had contracted by his transgression. And to the perpetuation of this likeness and image among men, reference is made in the Scriptures as follows. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. 51:5. "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." Gen. 8:21. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." Job 14:4. "What is man that he should be clean, and he

which is born of woman that he should be righteous." Job 15:14. "How then can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?" Job 25:4. "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be born speaking lies. Their poison is like the poison of a serpent: they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear, which will not hearken to the voice of the charmers, charming never so wisely." Ps. 52:3, 4, 5. "Yea, thou heardest not; yea, thou knewest not; yea, from that time that thine ear was opened, for I knew that thou wouldst deal very treacherously, and wast called a transgressor from the womb." Isa. 49:9. And thus other passages to the same effect might be cited. The Scriptures say nothing regarding the generation of only a part of man in the natural way; they say nothing regarding the introduction of the soul into the body from some outside source; and they say nothing regarding the introduction of sin into the soul at a certain period of its existence; but their whole teaching is such as leaves us to conclude that the whole man, body and soul, the living soul — whatever that may comprise — is produced according to natural law in the natural way; and that thus this natural corruption in man is transmitted with the soul in natural generation. As regards this point, we read, Form. Conc. Dec. 1:7: "And even at the present day, in this connection of sin and nature (in this corruption of nature), God does not create and make sin in us, but with the nature which God at the present day still creates and makes in men, original sin is propagated from sinful seed, through carnal conception and birth of father and mother." Hutter, S. D. p. 270, says: "If any of our brethren should ask which opinion we think most accordant with truth, we fearlessly answer that we precisely accord with the opinion of Luther, and hold it to be consonant with the Scripture, namely, that the human soul is propagated by traduction; so that, just as everything else produces its like, a lion begetting a lion, a horse begetting a horse, so also man begets man, and not only the flesh of the body, but also the soul is propagated as a real out-

growth from its parents. . . . and so our opinion is generally held among all pious people, viz., that the soul has its origin in traduction."

THESIS VIII.

Having reference to the manner in which this condition manifests itself in the family.

The Scriptures teach us that this sin within us is the source of all actual sin.

"All unrighteousness is sin," John 5:17, and such is the unrighteousness which we possess by nature. Not only is his nature unrighteous, but because of this unrighteousness in his nature, the doing of the natural man is unrighteous also. This sin in man is not something which he bears about with him as he would a corpse — it is not something dead, but on the contrary, it is very much alive. All life is characterized by activity in some form or other, and no less so is the life of original sin. If it were dead or inactive it would be, at least camparatively, harmless; but its life gives it a potency for harm which can bring only everlasting destruction to him who follows its dictates. It lives in man's nature like a powerful leaven, leavening the whole lump. It works and ferments within his soul, continually throwing off the dirt and vile foam of its fermentation, and with its vileness soiling and besmearing the whole man until impurity becomes more impure, wickedness more wicked, and the power of its deadly poison for destruction more potent. When uncurbed, it is in man's heart, as it were, an evil spirit which takes unto itself seven other spirits more wicked than itself, which enter in and dwell there and revel there until the man's last state is worse than the first. As it is natural for a living fountain to flow, so it is natural for this fountain of sin to send forth its vile waters of bitterness and death. It is a corrupt tree such as Christ tells us cannot bring forth good fruit. It brings forth after its kind — brings forth a poisonous, deadly fruit, the essential substance of whose every element is corruption, the worst of which is unspeakably abom-

inable, and the best of which, though it may seem fair and beautiful without, is within no better than the ashy apples of Sodom; for no matter how seemingly good the fruit of the natural man, it is even as we are told in Rom. 8:8: "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." This is in man a root that beareth gall and wormwood. Deut. 29:18. Its fruits are actual transgressions of God's law, and every transgression of the law is sin. 1 John 3:4. It is the fountain head, the source of all actual sins not only those which become manifest through external acts, but also of those which consist of the internal act only; not only of those which are voluntary, but also of those which are involuntary — done through ignorance or inconsiderately — not only of sins of commission, but likewise of sins of omission. These sins are the works of the flesh, as we read in Gal. 5:19-21: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, witchcraft, hatred, varience, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." They are the unfruitful works of darkness, as we read in Eph. 5:12. They are the deeds of the old man, as we read in Col. 3:9. They are dead works, as we read in Heb. 6:1; anl also 9:14. etc. True, the external act is only the fruit of the sin committed by the heart. The sin can and does exist independent of the external act, for "whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart," Matt. 5:28; and, "He that hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." 1 John 3:15. Besides, God is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart, He will try the reins, and judge men's secret sins as actual, whether they have manifested themselves in external deeds or not. "The thought of foolishness is sin." Prov. 2:49. The vain thoughts that enter into and lodge in man's heart, the wicked imaginations which arise within his soul, the filth and impurity which he so sedulously keeps hid in the most secret recesses of his soul will all be brought to light and judged in God's appointed time: "For there is nothing covered

that shall not be revealed; neither hid that shall not be made known." Luke 12:2. Christ says: "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Matt. 2:34; also, "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." Matt. 15:9. Thus it is this natural corruption or wickedness of the heart that gives rise to all transgression of God's law. It is the source of corruption that is in the world through lust. 2 Pet. 1:4. Temptation to sin may and frequently does come from without, yet all such temptation would be comparatively powerless were it not for the natural inclination to evil which exists in the heart. The sin is within man and not outside of him; and therefore, as Christ tells us, it is not that which enters into a man, but that which comes out of him that defiles him. It is the natural proneness to that which is evil that bears the fruit of actual transgression, and were it not for this old corrupt root, no such fruit would be borne. It is even as we read in St. James 1:14: "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin."

Thesis IX.

Having reference to the redemption of the family and the payment of its debt through another representative appointed by the Father.

The Scriptures teach us that, as through one man, the first Adam, we were plunged into this state of corruption, so through one man, Christ, the last Adam, we are again restored to the state of righteousness, purity, innocence, holiness, happiness, and dominion.

"As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness;

their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes." Rom. 3:10. 18. The picture which, in these words, St. Paul places before our eyes, presents, as we have seen in the foregoing theses, man's miserable outcast and forlorn condition by nature. In this condition, obstinately and wilfully contrary in his doing to the will of his Creator, he wanders in darkness without hope of release through any power of his own. In his natural state he gropes about in deepest gloom out of which he, by the exertion of his own puny powers, vainly seeks to find a way. Unenlightened, he walls and cries for release, not from sin itself, but from the torments and misery of sin, but is hemmed in on all sides, as it were, by walls of brass. Sin-polluted, helpless, and hopeless by nature, he stands, with death and destruction staring him in the face, and gazes, now with fear and trembling and the aspect of despair, and now with insolence, defiance, and mockery which has its source in the consciousness that all is lost. Into this awful condition, as we have seen, one man, by his disobedience, has plunged him.

Though man is powerless to find for himself a way out of this horrible condition, yet God has found a way for him, and that already before the foundations of the world were laid: 1 Pet. 1:20; Eph. 1:4, and therefore: "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; and they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death upon them hath the light shined." Isa. 9:2. Despite man's sinful and polluted condition, God yet loved him with an unspeakable love, and "gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16; and of Him it is that we read in Isa. 42:6. 7., "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand and will keep Thee, and will give Thee for a covenant of the people, for a light to the Gentiles: To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." This was He, "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to

be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men; and being founded in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. 2:6. 7. 8. This is the last Adam of whom it is said that He was made a quickening spirit. 1 Cor. 15:45. He it was who came to put on new flesh, and give new life to the dry bones in the valley of death; and it is even as St. Paul tells us: "You hath He quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. 2:1. "The Son quickeneth whom He will." John 5:21.

He it is who, through the atonement which He has made for us — for our sins, has become Lord of all. He has conquered sin, death, and the devil for us; and therefore everything has been given unto Him of the Father. He has the power to cleanse and purify man from sin, and has by the sacrifice of Himself upon the cross, purchased the right to do so; and having triumphed over all opposition of evil, all things have been put under His feet, His enemies have become His footstool; and therefore, "God hath also highly exalted Him, and hath given Him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. 2:9. 10. 11. Thus the last Adam, our Redeemer and Mediator, is Lord and King over all, with power and authority to do with and for us whatsoever He will. His sole object in obtaining this kingdom was, for the glory of God, to release man from the bondage of sin and death, to give light to those who sit in darkness, to seek and to save that which was lost. And He it is "who hath delivered us from the power of darkness." Col. 1:13. He it is who is the image of God, 2 Cor. 4:3., and it is the Father's will that we shall be conformed to the image of His Son. Hence, we are exhorted, Eph. 4:22. 23. 24. to "put off concerning the former conversation the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your

mind; and that ye put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." And concerning those who have put on Christ, it is also said in Col. 3: 10, that they have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him. As the sin of the first Adam is imputed unto us for unrighteousness, so the merits of the last Adam are imputed unto us for righteousness; and clothed in this righteousness, we stand justified before God. Abraham believed and it was accounted unto him for righteousness, Rom. 4:3; and so also this righteousness of Christ is imputed unto those who believe; and they are "justified freely by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus." Rom. 3:24. Where this glorious righteousness is imputed, there sin is no longer imputed; hence, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will impute sin." Rom. 4:7. 8. Whether original or actual, "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth from all sin." 1 John 1:7; even as we read in Isa. 1:18: "Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be whiter than snow; though they be red like crimson they shall be as wool."

The Scriptures teach us that in Christ all things are ours, and that we shall be heirs, and joint heirs with Him to the kingdom of God. He Himself tells us to be faithful until death, and He will give us a crown of life. Then those who are dead with Him, who have been crucified with Him, shall also reign with Him. Completely cleansed through the merits of the last Adam of the corruption which the disobedience of the first Adam brought upon them, they shall inherit those things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, and neither have they entered into the heart of any man — the things which God hath prepared for those who love Him, the glorious mansions in the Father's house which our blessed Savior has gone to prepare. Then will the glorified find that sin has forever vanished, and that the image of God has again been restored. The old, filthy rags of sin will have disappeared, and in their stead will be the gloriaus garment

of Christ's righteousness. Power and dominion will be theirs; in their hearts righteousness and true holiness will have found a permanent dwelling place; and between them and their Creator complete harmony will reign, and full communion will be restored, while bliss and joy and ever increasing delight will be theirs forever more.

Such, according to my weak view, in the light of higher authorities, is the teaching of the Scriptures concerning original sin. In one form or another this doctrine stands forth clearly and distinctly on almost every sacred page, holding before man's eyes, as it were, a mirror in which he can see the sin-scarred features of his deformed visage. Like a ghastly bloody thread it is tightly woven into the warp of the whole web of Revelation from Genesis to the Apocalypse. If the Scriptures are to stand, the doctrine of original sin must stand; for were it eliminated the whole Scripture would be void, and the redemptive work of Jesus Christ would be a farce. And likewise we see this original sin, like a bloody thread, also tightly woven into the warp of the life-web of the whole human race from Adam downward to the present day, in the life-web of nations and of individuals. On all sides, this sin gazes upon man, as it were, through the glittering eyes of that infernal serpent which said unto our first parents, "Ye shall not surely die," fascinating him with their glitter, blasting his life, destroying his hope, and opening before his shuddering vision the interminable caverns of destruction and death. Like a remorseless conjurer, whose greatest joy is to inspire terror and inflict pain, it calls up hosts of demons to torture man until, unable to bear more, he falls by the wayside, or permits the frenzy of his madness to drive his poor soul into the abysmal depths of nethermost perdition. And although full atonement has been made by the Lord Jesus Christ, and grace and pardon are freely offered unto all, yet because of this sin, comparatively few attain unto the repossession of the lost family estate; while on the contrary the mighty, surging waves of humanity, at full flood, sweep onward only to roll through those dark and dread portals where hope goes out in night, and break

and spend their force against the adamantine walls of the infernal world, there to settle in the gloom and blackness of everlasting despair; for as Christ Himself tells us, Matt. 7: 13. 14, "Wide is the gate and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because straight is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it;" and further, He also assures us that, while many are called, but few are chosen.

NOTES.

G. H. S.

FOREIGNERS AND WOMEN AT GERMAN UNIVERSITIES.

The foreign contingent at the German universities during the current winter semester is 3096, as compared with 2944 in the past summer and 3093 a year ago. This is 7.8 per cent. of the entire enrollment, a proportion that has maintained itself with remarkable firmness for some years past. According to the most reliable university reporter in Germany, the *Frankfurter Zeitung,* these outsiders are distributed as follows: 778 in the medical department; 718 in philosophy, philology and history; 601 in mathematics and natural sciences; 398 in law; 176 in agriculture; 217 in political economy and forestry; 142 in Protestant theology; 30 in Catholic theology; 24 in dentistry, and 13 in pharmacy. Berlin by far leads in its foreign enrollment, there being 1154, followed by Leipzig, with 443; Munich, with 291; Halle, with 173; Heidelberg, with 160; Grettingen, with 117; Freiberg, with 116; Strassburg, with 89; Jena, with 80; Bonn and Koenigsburg, each with 71; Breslau, with 56; Marburg, with 53; Wurzburg, with 50; Giessen, with 48; Tübingen, with 40; Greifswald, with 28; Erlangen, with 18; Rostock, with 16; Münster, with 12, and Kiel, with 11. Of these 3096 students, 2665 are from European countries and 432 from other lands. The cos-

mopolitan character of this contingent can be judged by the following distribution: Russia, 974; Austro-Hungary, 631; Switzerland, 318; Great Britain, 155; Bulgaria, 96; Roumania, 78; France, 67; Greece, 54; Sweden and Norway, 40; Luxemburg, 39; Italy, 32; Spain and Turkey, each 28; Belgium, 14; Denmark, 10; Montanegro, 2; Lichtenstein, 1; as also 295 from America, 110 from Asia, 19 from Africa and 8 from Australia.

The number of women at the German universities during the present semester is 1764. Of these 122 are immatriculated and all in South German institutions, viz.: 2 in Erlangen, 31 in Freiburg, 32 in Heidelberg, 47 in Munich, 4 in Tuebingen, and 4 in Wuerzburg. Of the 1642 "Hoererinnen," Berlin has 657; Bonn, 96; Breslau, 119; Erlangen, 2; Freiburg, 51; Giessen, 34; Goettingen, 69; Halle, 58; Heidelberg, 30; Jena, 36; Kiel, 15; Koenigsberg, 91; Leipzig, 91; Marburg, 10; Munich, 21; Rostock, 9; Strassburg, 229 (a phenomenal increase over the preceding term, when it was only 31); Tuebingen, 28; Wuerzburg, 5. Greifwald and Muenster have no women students. In the technological institutes of the empire there are 702 women students, the greatest number, 247, being in the new institution in Danzig.

WONDERFUL EXCAVATIONS AT ANCIENT GEZER.

The long-lost royal Canaanite city of Gezer was discovered some years ago by M. Clermont-Ganneau, and it was one of the oldest and most famous cities of Palestine. It is one of the few remarkable bastions which the Shephela flings out to the west, on a ridge running toward Ramleh, the most prominent object in view of the traveler from Jaffa toward Jerusalem. It is high and isolated, but fertile and well watered — a very strong post and striking landmark. Gezer lay near the roads from Damascus to Egypt and from Jerusalem to the sea, and yet it was as much of a khan as it was a fortress — a stronghold on the frontier for the defense of Jerusalem from southern or western invaders.

The excavations at ancient Gezer show that it was at least a city three thousand years before Christ, and of the successive eras of Amorites, Canaanites, Hebrews and Philintines, Maccabees, and finally of Romans. The excavations show how one city was built in turn over the ruins of the older city, and the work has gone on steadily until seven ancient cities, one above another, have been successively unearthed. Pottery of the rudest description, belonging to the earliest period of cave dwellers, has been found, and also the crematorium where they burned their dead.

When the Egyptians, under the Pharaohs of the 18th dynasty, conquered Canaan, Gezer was placed under the Egyptian governor. In the time of the Tel el-Amarna tablets (B. C. 1400) the governor was Yaplaki, and in those tablets three of the letters were sent by Yapakhi, and in them he begs Pharaoh to help him against the attacks of an invading people called the Habiri. Merenptah, king of Egypt about 1250 B. C., records the capture of Gezer in the same stele in which the enigmatic passage occurs: "Israel is destroyed; his crops are no more."

The excavations at Gezer have found groups of ancient tombs which occur on the slopes of the elongated hill, which was the site of a settlement long before the exodus. Walls have been discovered, and burial places both of a pre-Semitic and early Semitic race have now completed the series from extra-mural cemeteries. These cemeteries belong to four ages. The most ancient group contains the remains of an early Semitic (Canaanite) race. One of these had been a rock-cut dwelling of the preceding or troglodyte race, whose burial places had been already investigated. In four others a veritable shaft opened out at the bottom into a chamber. The bones of the occupants had almost crumbled into dust, but just enough remained to show that they had been lying on the side in a crouching position. A little pottery was found, some vessels containing traces of food and drink, with lamps, a spearhead, a curved knife, and hairpins (all of bronze), and a few scarabs belonging to the twelfth or thirteenth dynasty. Amulets were discovered (one represent-

ing a cow divinity of Egypt, another a Phœnican Ashtoreth), a bronze sword and scimiter, rings and bracelets of the same, many copper javelin heads, with a few Assyrian cylinders and Egyptian scarabs (one of Psammeticus I., contemporary with Manasseh). They also found the jar-burial of sacrificed infants and the stones of idolatrous worship. A magnificent double wall of Solomon's time can also be seen.

Gezer was occupied by the Bedouin sheiks Labai (who had once been governor of Shunem) and his confederate, Malchiel, and it joined in an attack on Ebed-tob, the king of Jerusalem. When the Israelites entered Canaan, Horam was king of Gezer, and Gezer joined Lachish in opposing the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan; but its king, Horam, was defeated and slain by Joshua (Joshua 10:33). The Israelites, however, were unable to capture the city, and it remained independent down to the time of Solomon. A recently discovered inscription (B. C. 1280) tells of the Egyptians' still having charge of Gezer. The king of Egypt, having captured it, gave it to Solomon as a dowry for his daughter, who was Solomon's wife (1 Kings 9:16). Solomon thereupon restored it, as well as the neighboring Beth-horon, and it henceforth remained in Israelitish possession. It played an important part in the wars between the Maccabees and the Greek Selucid kings, and, under the name of Mount Gisart, it was a stronghold of the Crusaders. The latest mention is an account of a battle between the governor of Jerusalem and certain Bedouins in 1495 A. D. It appears thus that Gezer had a continuous history from at least 1500 B. C. to 1500 A. D.

During the sixteenth century the place fell into decay, and even the memory of its site was forgotten. It was stumbled on accidentally by Clermont-Ganneau, and important discoveries have been made. He found it near the small neighborhing village of Abu Skusheh, and had the good fortune to discover a stone in the vicinity which bore the inscription in Hebrew letters: "Boundary of Gezer." This is one of the most interesting archæological discoveries yet made in

Palestine, and Gezer will go on giving up its secrets. It is a work of great size, and is an ideal site as regards its successive layers of remains. It is said that the Palestine Exploration Fund is doing wonderful work at Gezer, and that the oldest walls consist of uncoursed masonry, in which the larger stones are undress field bowlders.

THE ASSUMPTIONIST PROPAGANDA IN FRANCE.

The collision between the political authorities in France and the Assumptionists threatens the laurels of the Jesuits as the historical mischief maker among the religious orders in favor of a comparatively youthful and little known society. The trial of the Assumptionists has brought out some interesting details in reference to the character, the methods and manner of this order, for the following summary of which we are indebted to the Leipzig *Chronik* No. 15:

The Assumptionists have in recent years been especially conspicuous for their vast publication interests, all of which are devoted to bitter attacks on the Protestants and practically to an anti-republic agitation in favor of a restoration of the monarchical form of government. The *Maison de Bonns Presse* managed by them is a vast concern. The chief publication is the weekly known throughout the Catholic world as *La Croix*, which appears in an edition of more than a million copies every seventh day, and besides is aided by similar periodical sheets under the same name that appears in many of the provinces. So intolerant have been the polemics of the *Croix* that even such papers as the Paris *Figaro*, generally favorable to the Catholic Church has protested against the bigotry that makes Protestants, Free Masons, Jews, and Infidels all one class of subjects. The recent trial has not resulted in a conviction of the patres of machination against the republic, but has brought to light some other data of rare interest. The Assumptionist cloisters were all searched, and although the order by its canons is not allowed either collectively or individually to possess any property, a

"war fund" of 1,800,000 francs was found in charge of Pater Hippotyte. The Assumptionists had been charged with two crimes: (1) with having organized an association contrary to law; (2) with having made a false report of its property holding. The trial developed the fact that this congregation has at present four hundred members and owns fourteen institutions of various kinds in Paris and the provinces. They bear their name in honor of the "Assumptio," or Ascension of the Virgin Mary, whom they especially adore. The society is only fifty years old, having been organized in Southern France by a pious priest named d' Aleson, with the general purpose of "the extension of the Kingdom of Christ," and devotes itself particularly to mission work. In recent years it has turned its attention largely to publication methods, and through its devotion to Saint Antonius of Padua, has managed to secure a monthly income of about 150,000 francs for the "good press." The statutes of the order were approved by Pius IX, and only two years ago the leaders were officially warned to adhere to the original tenets of the founder, especially that of despising all earthly possessions. In order to make practice and precept at least seemingly to harmonize, the large sums and properties belonging to the society are nominally held by individual members. The money is spent for various religious purposes. Thus, e. g., during the past year the order paid 262,205 francs for railroad tickets for the Lourdes pilgrims. It is claimed by prominent men in the Church that the agitation of the patres against the republic has been carried on against the express instruction of the vatican.

The first trial has ended in the decree of the courts that the society must be dissolved. This was done on the ground of public morality, some of the publications of the society, notoriously the *Vie de Saint Antoine,* being pornographical in the extreme, and matters were made all the worse by the fact that their publications were prepared and sent out by pious sisters at work in the printing concern of the congregation. The patres have appealed from this decision to the judgment of a higher court.

It is not surprising that voices of protest against the Assumptionist morals found utterance in the Catholic press itself, although Arch-bishop Cardinal Richard did publicly express his sympathy with the patres, a step that resulted in a reproof from the government. What the final outcome of this struggle between the government and the Assumptionists and their allies will be, only a prophet or a prophet's son would venture to predict.

Columbus Theological Magazine.

THIS Magazine is designed to supply the want of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim is the exposition and defense of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers, 35 cents.

All remittances should be addressed to LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, Columbus, Ohio. All communications pertaining to the Editorial Department and all exchanges to PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., Columbus, Ohio.

"The Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20, 28.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

IN ITS FOUNDATION, ESSENCE, APPEARANCE AND WORK.

By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.

Prompted by the purest motive, the desire to serve his Master by being helpful to his fellow-laborers, fully conscious that the unscriptural views on the subject endanger the soul and shonld be exposed, and confident "that the King will accompany it with His blessing," the author wrote and published this work.

"This work is notable for its comprehensive and yet simple analysis of its subject, and for its earnest devotion to the practical topics and problems that spring out of the Church life at every point." — *Lutheran Church Review.*

"The work is carefully prepared and well written. — *Lutheran Observer.*

The book contains 364 pages and sells for $1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

THE LUTHERAN COMMENTARY

By Scholars of the Lutheran Church in the United States under the editorial charge of Dr. H. E. Jacobs. This is a very valuable work and especially adapted to the wants of Pastors and Sunday-school Teachers. The 12 volumes bound in full cloth have been reduced in price from $2.00 to $1.50 per volume. We would call special attention to volume VI on the Acts of the Apostles by Dr. F. W. Stellhorn. Having too large a number on hand we will sell this volume until our stock is exhausted, at $1.25 per volume. Address :: :: :: :: :: ::

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 E. MAIN ST., COLUMBUS, O.

MODEL SERMONS. SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

By DR. M. LOY, Dean in Capital University.

These sermons are first scriptural then logical; noted for their simplicity in style and depth of thought, in full harmony with the confessions of the Lutheran Church. Preachers need these sermons as models, teachers will want them to use in the public service in the absence of the pastor, parents will find them to be just what they need in the home service on Sunday, and any Christian, young or old, will find in them the Manna which came down from heaven by which his soul is nourished unto eternal life.

Price, plain cloth, $2.50; half leather, $3.00; half morocco, $4.00;
Imitation morocco, two volumes, $4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

BEFORE THE ALTAR

OR A SERIES OF ANNOTATED PROPOSITIONS ON LITURGICS, TO WHICH IS ADDED A SELECTION OF STANDARD FORMS.

BY DR. C. H. L. SCHUETTE.

The author in his introduction remarks: "The writer will consider himself amply repaid for his labor, if this little book shall add to the number of those among God's people who worship 'with understanding:' and if ministers will take up the subject as it is here outlined and discuss it before their people, say in a course of lectures, there can be no doubt as to the result."

Price, bound in cloth, 75 cents; flexible, $1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

CHRISTIAN PRAYER

By M. LOY, D. D.

This book is in fact an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Pastors are inquiring for sermons on the catechism. There is nothing better in the English language on this, the third part of the catechism. Eight articles treat *The Model Prayer* in a general way, four explain and emphasize the words "Our Father." "Hallowed be Thy Name" is explained in three articles; "Thy Kingdom Come" in four. "Thy Will be Done" in seven articles, and "Give us this day our Daily Bread" in five." "Forgive us our Debts" is treated in five articles, and each of the remaining parts of the prayer is treated in four articles. Besides all this there are fifteen articles on "The Practice of Prayer," concluding with an article on the question: "Have You Family Worship?"

People who never pray should read this book that they may be brought to a sense of their duty and privilege. Those who have not been neglecting this Christian privilege will be encouraged to continue on the right way.

Price, 75 Cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

THE MEANS OF GRACE

BY REV. G. T. COOPERRIDER, A. M.

It furnishes a clear and adequate explanation of the Word and Sacraments, God's own appointed means for conveying to us His grace unto our salvation, rather in the light of a practical, broad interpreter than as a treatise of technicalities.

Handsomely Bound in full cloth, XIV and 157 pages. Per copy, 75 cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXV. AUGUST, 1905. No. 4.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

I. THE CLEARNESS OF THE SCRIPTURES.

In themselves the Scriptures are absolutely clear. That is, in the mind of the real Author of the written Word, the Holy Spirit, the meaning and import of every passage and word was perfectly transparent. Whatever lack of clearness there may accordingly be in the understanding of the Scriptures is due either to the persons through whom the Holy Spirit spoke or to the persons who read the Scriptures. In this sense the difficulties and lack of clearness in the Word are relative but not absolute. They all have their origin in the greater or less inability of the readers to put themselves exactly into the position of the Author of these books. Just to the degree in which this can be done by the reader are the Scriptures clear; the degree in which it is impossible for the reader to do so is also the degree to which the Scriptures are dark. In all matters pertaining to supernatural truth and revelation, even in passages generally conceded to be clear, this clearness is only relative. We cannot possibly understand intellectually the mysteries of revelation as these are present in the mind of God. Our understanding of the natures and the person of Christ, the Trinity, the Atonement and the like is only partial and superficial as far as the inner condition of these great truths is concerned. Even these things, although from a comparative point of view revealed with phenomenal clearness in the *loci classici*, we see only

through a glass darkly. This is as God intended them to be, since these great facts of redemption are the objects of faith and not the objects of sight and understanding. In so far as God intended them to be revealed to us as objects of mental conception and ideas, they certainly are the most transparent in the Scriptures. But beyond the limits of our knowledge laid down in the Word the mind of man cannot penetrate these divine truths, as the mind has not the power to do so. In this way we have the singular result that the passages which are the most clear in the Scriptures, from another point of view, lack this clearness to the greatest degree and do so in accordance with the purposes of the Author of the Word. No truth is taught more clearly in the Pauline Epistle than righteousness by faith alone and the atonement through the blood of Christ; yet in themselves these great facts are the deepest of mysteries and are beyond and above the comprehension of even the keenest minds. The clearness of the Scriptures accordingly does not imply that we are to penetrate into the mind and thought of the writer in this way that the things they say become the objects of intelligent mental conception on our parts, but only that we understand so much of the truths of revelation as the Holy Spirit intended to convey to us through this Word. In the absolute sense of the term the Scriptures are clear only to their divine Author. To claim this for the human reader too is the fundamental principle of rationalism.

But even the relative clearness which the Author of the Scriptures intended to convey to the reader is only too often not attained. The difficulty may lie in the form in which the thought is expressed, it being practically at times impossible for the reader to put himself so entirely into the position of the writer that the words of the latter will photograph exactly in the mind of the former the thought that these words are to convey. It is all the more difficult because in its method of thought and expression the Scriptures are largely an Oriental book in which the historical circumstances that surrounded the composition of a prophecy,

or an epistle or a gospel are everywhere reflected. Just in proportion as these circumstances can be reproduced the reader will have a clear idea of what the author intended to say. It accordingly is found in the nature of the case, that a passage may be perfectly clear to one reader and dark to another, and in this respect too the clearness of the Scriptures is relative, even within the limitations drawn by the character of the Scriptures themselves and by the nature of the subjects they contain. The possibility then of two persons, equally anxious for the truth and equally willing to listen to the truth, understanding the meaning of certain passages differently, is a fact that cannot be denied. It is neither a mental nor a moral defect, other things being equal, if one person finds in a passage one idea and another finds a different thought. This is of course contrary to the purposes of the Author of the Scriptures, but it is a fact only too well attested by the history of Exegesis. The claim so often put forth by Missouri in the present controversy, that the passages on Predestination are so "sonnenklar," is nothing else but a *petitio principii*. The subject is one that has vexed and perplexed the Church for centuries, and it certainly would be more than peculiar if, in case these passages were so transparent, all preceding generations of devout scholars and theologians had been mentally and morally so defective that the clearness of these passages had only blinded them. In other words, these passages are *not* so transparent that the possibility for debate or a difference of interpretation is excluded. Some of these at any rate are open exegetical *cruces*, because they belong to those passages in which, for reasons in the Scriptures and in the interpreter, there is a lack of clearness.

II. THE ARGUMENTATIVE VALUE OF THE ANALOGY OF FAITH.

The principle of the analogy of faith, or in the wider application of the rule, of the Scriptures, can be accepted as a factor in interpretation only by him who accepts the

full inspiration of the Scriptures. It is the same fact that justifies the principle of parallelism as a hermeneutical rule in the explanation of the Scriptures but will not and cannot sanction it as a rule in the explanation of a secular literature. It is the uniqueness of the Scriptures as the word of revealed truth which justifies this unique rule of interpretation. It stands only because of the impossibility of the different writers of the Scriptures, all moved by the same one spirit, of contradicting each other. With the inerrancy of the Word the analogy of faith would also fall away.

But the principle is based on the conviction of the Christian Church that the Scriptures cannot contradict each other. It is thus based on a *quasi* negative conviction and fact, and thus determines the argumentative value of the principle itself. We do not maintain that two authors in the Scriptures in speaking concerning the same subject must say the same thing or must repeat each other. It is only maintained by this principle that in speaking of the same subject they cannot and do not teach different things. There can be nothing contradictory between them. The difficulty naturally, as a rule lies in determining whether certain passages are parallel or in deciding just exactly how far the analogy of faith goes and what it embraces and includes and what not. There is no doubt that on this subject there has always been a certain indefiniteness and vagueness, but not in reference to the essential and fundamental doctrines. Nobody, we believe, has ever drawn up or compiled a code that contained only what is included in the analogy of faith or of the Scriptures and excluded everything else. In some matters there can be an honest doubt whether a certain teaching is included in this analogy or not. Does the analogy of faith demand that we dare not claim that Paul in Romans teaches the final accpetance of Jesus by the Jews as a nation? However great the argumentative value of the analogy of faith principle may be, it evidently can be depended upon only in the essentials of

faith, in cases where it is absolutely certain that certain teachings fall into the sphere of its teachings.

But even in its proper sphere the principle itself is only of a negative and not of a positive value in interpretation. Interpreting a dark passage in the light of a clear, simply means that the dark passage dare not be interpreted to mean anything contrary to the clear. What it actually does teach will depend on circumstances and must be judged by other hermeneutical principles, chiefly the context. James seemingly makes some strange statements on the matter of faith and works, which called forth Luther's rather hard judgment on his Epistle. Paul, especially in Romans and Galatians, expounds this subject so clearly that he who runs may read. The analogy of faith demands that James' teaching be not interpreted in any way that will conflict with the transparent exposition of Paul; but what James actually does teach is not to be determined by the analogy of faith but by the context and other facts and data. The analogy of faith, in the case of a disputed passage, simply states what that passage must *not* mean; its actual meaning depends on other principles. After the elimination of all false interpretations there still may be a number of possible meanings that are perfectly in harmony with the general teachings of the Scriptures. Which of these possibly correct meanings is the correct one intended by the writer cannot in the nature of the case be determined by the analogy of faith, but by other hermeneutical rules. The analogy of faith as a principle in interpretation is excellent in warding off errors, as has again been demonstrated by the present phase of the Predestination controversy; but that is the extent of its argumentative value.

III. LUTHERAN DOCTRINES AND THEIR SCRIPTURAL BASIS.

How many among us Lutheran pastors really examine thoroughly and according to the recognized correct principles of interpretation the Scriptural basis for the teachings of our Church, especially for its distinct and peculiar doctrines? Dogmatics are based upon exegesis and not

exegesis upon dogmatics. Whatever fair and honest Biblical interpretation brings forth, this the dogmatician must take and with the material thus obtained he must construct his system. Dogmatics is the queen of theological sciences; but it is such because it summons together and puts into systematic form what the researches in the Scriptures have produced, and, secondly, because upon its principles are based the practical branches of theology in their matter and methods. It is of course incorrect to say that dogmatics exercise no control over exegesis; for in truth such principles as the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the unity of the Scriptural teachings, their harmony and oneness are dogmatical propositions that are really gained independently of exegetical processes. If an exegete believes that the Scriptures do not contradict each other, he does so because he accepts the dogmatical proposition of the inspiration of these Scriptures, and thus he has gained, not as a result of an exact examination of all the passages between the lids of the Bible, but because of evidence in the Scriptures indeed, the testimony of the Holy Spirit has convinced him of this, but not because he has proved to his own mind and intelligence by the ordinary processes of reasoning that these books are inspired. He believes in this inspiration, and in so far this is an a priori dogmatical proposition that controls his exegesis. But within these general limitations, based on the inspiration and the inerrancy of the Scriptures, exegesis is independent of dogmatics. Are the teachings of our Church really and actually the results of a careful and correct investigation of the Scriptural passages upon which they are based? This we firmly believe because they were originally brought forth on the basis of such a study of the Word of God. Luther and our great dogmaticians were great Bible students. But are we? A traditional acceptance of Lutheran doctrines is not an intelligent acceptance of these teachings. Even if historically correct, that our system is the Biblical system pure and simple, it should become such for each and every one of us personally; and this it can become only if we, too, closely

and in a perfectly unprejudiced way study the Scriptural basis of our faith. Nor will it do merely to work over again the traditional exegesis of our Church. This is indeed excellent, but as much of it was written with a view to conditions now past, this much is now out of date, and on the other hand, in the good sense of the term, our exegetical work, as well as our dogmatical, should be "up to date." We should be ready to give the reasons for our faith in view of the problems and perplexities of our own times too. To examine our doctrines in this way is a psychological task of no small dimensions. It is such an easy matter to read dogmatical convictions into Scriptural passages that it takes a great deal of self-denial and self-control to examine the Scriptural statements in an unprejudiced and perfectly fair way. And yet particularly the pastor should constantly ask himself, not for the purpose of awakening doubt, but in order to feel fully convinced and confirmed in his own mind: Do the passages which our dogmatics and our catechism assign as proof passages for our teachings really prove what they are intended to prove, and wherein does this proof lie and how is it drawn from these premises? A study of the Scriptures with this mind of sincere inquiry and investigation cannot but be profitable and prove an incentive to conscientious Bible study.

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

BY REV. M. R. WALTER, LOUDONVILLE, O.

One of the most difficult subjects in the sphere of theology is the doctrine relating to the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. There is no article treating directly on this subject in the Confessions of our church, nor is it specifically mentioned in the Book of Concord. Many of our dogmaticians are silent on this theme. Many commentators dismiss the subject with but little more than passing reference. But our Confessions do, in an indirect way, teach the doctrine of this subject very satisfactorally.

There are difficult questions which arise from the study of this subject that have led many into vain speculations. The writer of this presentation endeavors to avoid speculations, and hold to the Scripture doctrine in conformity to the teachings of the Lutheran Church. The position of the Lutheran Church on the subject of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost is set forth in the propositions here submitted.

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.*

The Major Proposition:

On the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit did not only come to confer the special gifts, viz., the power to the disciples to speak with tongues and to perform miracles, but He came to dwell, with increased measure, in the Church to confer upon all believers, by and through the Word, the blessings won for us by Christ's life and death upon the cross and made potent unto men by Christ ascending to the right hand of the Father. The coming and out-pouring of the Spirit on Pentecost is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Explanatory Propositions:

The Baptism of the Holy Ghost,

I. Is not the ordinary nor extraordinary giving of the Holy Ghost in the Old Testament;

II. Is not the ordinary, nor every extraordinary giving of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament;

III. But it is the one specific outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost according to promises of the Prophets of the Old Testament, by John the Baptist and Christ Himself, and testified to by the Apostles in the New Testament.

IV. The out-pouring of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost was the coming of the Spirit into the New Covenant Church with increased measure to exercise His office in bestowing the merits of Christ upon believers.

V. The particular gifts of the Spirit, such as the speaking with tongues and the power to perform miracles,

* Conference Paper, published by resolution of that body.

were given to the disciples on Pentecost, and also to many others afterward, in the Apostolic times, to enable the disciples to carry out the command to preach the Gospel to every nation.

VI. The out-pouring of the Spirit on Pentecost, and His operations in the Church at all times are only by and through the Word of God.

The major proposition is a summary of the theses presented, and is introductory, while the minor propositions are explanatory.

The Major Proposition:

On the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit did not only come to confer the special gifts, viz., the power to the disciples to speak with tongues and to perform miracles, but He came to dwell, with increased measure, in the Church to confer upon all believers, by and through the Word, the blessings won for us by Christ's life and death upon the cross and made potent unto men by Christ ascending to the right hand of the Father. The coming and out-opuring of the Spirit on Pentecost is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

The Baptism of the Holy Ghost came not without prophesy and warrant and the agency of the Word of God. As positively as the birth of our Savior was foretold, and the fulfillment of that prophesy was realized to the very letter of the Word, so, too, was the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost positively foretold and consummated. The prophets in the Old Covenant Church in the Old Testament, John the Baptist and Christ in the New Testament, foretold the Pentecostal blessing. The prophets in the Old Testament clearly predicted the special gift of God's Spirit to be given to the Church, or rather poured out into the Church, at some future time. True, the term "baptism" is not the term employed by them; but the act, and the scope, and the influence, and the power of the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost was foretold by the Lord through the writings of the inspired men of old. John the Baptist is positive in his statement and is the first to use the words "Baptize with the Holy Ghost." Then, on Ascension Day,

Christ confirms John's predictions and promises by the assurance that in a few days the disciples shall experience the fulfillment of the prophesy. After ten days, when the Spirit was poured out, the Apostles pointed to the preceding prophesies and promises concerning the out-pouring of the Spirit as having been fulfilled that day.

Let us consider some of the prophesies of those men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Isa. 32, 14-17: "Because the palaces shall be forsaken; the multitude of the city shall be left; the forts and the towers shall be for dens forever, a joy of wild asses, a pasture for flocks; until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high and the fruitful field be counted for a forest. The judgment shall dwell in the wilderness and righteousness remain in the fruitful field; and the works of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever." Isa. 44, 3: "I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thy offspring."

Joel 2, 28-32: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions; and also upon the servants and handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit, and I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood and fire and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes; and it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered; for in Mt. Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance as the Lord hath said." This Scripture passage Peter quoted in justification of the manifestation of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost.

"Thus saith the Lord God * * * I will give them one heart, and I will put a new Spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh: that they may walk in my statutes." Ezek. 11, 19-20.

"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." Ezek. 36, 25-27. [Isa. 52, 15; Jer. 32, 37-42.]

Zach. 12, 10: "And I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of Grace and Supplications; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first born."

This prophesy shows that the out-pouring of the Spirit shall not take place until after the passion of the Messiah, who shall be pierced on the cross. Joel predicts that it shall be before the Judgment Day comes.

The old regime was drawing to a close, and the precursor of the Savior, the Elijah to prepare the way of the Lord, had appeared as a preacher of repentance among men, for, "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness." In turning the minds of the people away from himself unto Christ, he proclaimed this prophecy concerning the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost, Matt. 3, 11: "I indeed baptize with water unto repentance, but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear. He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

After the life of suffering, bitter death upon the cross, the victorious resurrection from the grave and appearing among the brethren in the forty days following that glad Easter morn, Christ took His disciples with Him upon Mount Olive and gave them the comforting command, "That they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith He, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with

the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Ten days passed away. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts 2, 1-4. Peter bears testimony that this out-pouring of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost is the promised Baptism of the Holy Ghost when he rehearses the incident connected with the conversion of Cornelius, the centurion of Cæsarea, Acts, 11, where he says: "And as I began to speak the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the Word of the Lord, how that He said, 'John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.' Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as He did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I could withstand God?" Christ promised that the Holy Ghost would surely descend after He had ascended to the right hand of the Father. This promise of the Comforter was also given by the Father through the prophets.

The out-pouring of the Holy Ghost was not to convert the disciples, for they were the children of God and in the Kingdom of Heaven (Luke 17, 21, "Behold, the Kingdom of God is within you") but to give power unto the disciples that they might, with the new light shed abroad in their hearts, appreciate, discern and apprehend the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. The Spirit came to lead, not only the disciples then, but all believers in all times into all truth. The prime object of the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost was not to reveal Himself, but to reveal Christ through the Word. John 16, 13-14. "Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak, and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of Mine and shall show it unto

you." Yet this promise of the gift of the Holy Ghost was given not only to the disciples, as some teach, but unto the entire Christian Church. Until Pentecost, the disciples, much as they loved Christ, did not understand the freedom offered in the Gospel and the great field of the Lord's Kingdom. But when the Spirit came, power was given them to comprehend that not only Israel, but also the Gentile world, was to be evangelized. This same power which gave the disciples new light, strength and increase in the knowledge of the truth is the same power of the Holy Spirit with which He has governed the Christian Church since that day of Pentecost. On Pentecost the Spirit came into His office in the Church to confer, through the Word, with increased measure, the blessings won for us by Christ's life and death upon the cross, and made potent unto men by Christ ascending to the right hand of the Father. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." John 16, 7. And the Church also confesses: "Now while God clearly promises, in the Scriptures, that the church shall always have the Holy Spirit, He also earnestly warns us that false teachers and wolves will insinuate themselves into the church among the genuine ministers of God. But, properly speaking, the church which has the Holy Ghost is the Christian Church." Apology of the Augsburg Conf.

"Until the last day the Holy Ghost will remain with this holy community or Christian Church." Also, "The Holy Ghost exerts His agency without intermission, until the final day; and for that purpose He has ordained a community or church upon earth, through which He speaks and performs all things." Luther's Large Catechism.

The Spirit dwells in the Church constantly and shall remain in the church until the end, dispensing the Spiritual gift He showered down on Pentecost, namely, the completion of the work of salvation by Christ. Christ was born, had lived, suffered, died, was buried, had descended into hell, arisen from the dead glorified, ascended into Heaven, where He, at the right hand of the Father, makes intercession for

us, all for the salvation and spiritual comfort of men. All these merits of Christ are the gifts the Spirit bestows upon the Church, and by and through the Word He gives us the power of faith to accept and apply them to our own souls, that we may increase in grace and faith, advance in sanctification and grow in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, as our confessions declare:

"I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to Him; but the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me with His gifts, sanctified and kept me in the true faith: even as He calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and keeps it with Jesus Christ in the one true faith; in which Christian Church He daily and richly forgives all sins to me and all believers, and will at the last day raise up me and all the dead, and give unto me and all believers in Christ eternal life. This is most certainly true."—*Luther's Small Catechism.*

These gifts offered by the Spirit in the New Covenant Church are richer, stronger, fuller in measure than were bestowed upon the Old Covenant Church, for until the fulfillment of the promises concerning Christ's redemptory work had been completed, the full joy and comfort, and knowledge, and power of the Gospel could not be applied, as is stated John 7, 39. "For the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified"; that is, the Spirit had not yet come with the complete work of Christ to establish the Church of Christ and preserve it, which is the work and the office of the Spirit in the Church. On Pentecost the Spirit entered into His full office in the Church. The time for the fulfillment of the promises of the Father and the Son, that the Spirit should be poured out upon the Church had come. The joy and peace and gladness showered down upon the disciples on Pentecost fulfilling the promises of God are the heritage of Christ's Church on earth, and have been dispensed in the Church since that day by the Spirit through the Word, and shall be the riches and the glory of the Church forever more.

These full gifts were not in the possession of the Old Covenant Church, for the Baptism of the Church with the Holy Ghost had not yet been administered. Hence we pass to the first minor proposition:—

I. The Baptism of the Holy Ghost is not the ordinary nor the extraordinary giving of the Holy Ghost in the Old Testament.

The Holy Ghost is eternal. He was with the Father and the Son before the foundation of the world was laid. He is God. The attributes of the Godhead are ascribed to Him as well as to the Father and to the Son. Love, mercy and justice belong to Him too.

Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father, is the Savior of the world for all people. Although He came to complete the work of salvation only when four thousand years after the fall of man had passed, yet by Him the Saints of old were saved by faith. The Holy Spirit operated through the Word in the hearts of men then as now, creating faith in their souls which was counted unto them for righteousness. Heb. chapter 11; Isa. 55, 8-11; Ps. 19, 7-11; 107, 19-20; 119, 50; 130, 5. Those who were saved in the Old Covenant while the long preparation for the coming of Christ and the establishing of His kingdom was in progress, such as the Patriarchs, Prophets and the other elect of God, were saved by the same Savior, through the same faith that saved the Virgin Mary, John the Baptist, the Apostles and all the sainted Christians since the establishment of the New Covenant Church. The regeneration of the people in the Old Covenant was through the gracious operation of the Holy Ghost by the agency of the Word.

In the time of the Patriarchs the Word of God was not found in Scripture form. For nearly twenty-five hundred years, until the time of Moses, the Word came direct from God, and was handed down traditionally from generation to generation. Even when God spake directly, as well as when He spoke through messengers, the Holy Spirit was the life-giving power in the Word unto the hearts of

men, so that they could accept the truth and by the truth be enabled to conform their will to the will of God by faith.

The Scriptures of old came from God as it is written: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter 1, 20-21. From the beginning in Eden to the last revelation on Patmos, God made Himself known unto men by the Word, and this Word has been the medium employed by the Spirit of God in operating in the hearts of men in all ages. God's Word is always powerful and spirit, immaterial as to the form and manner God has chosen to reveal Himself. The Law as well as the Gospel is a means through which the Holy Ghost operates. Both the Law and the Gospel are found throughout the history of the Old Covenant Church, though the Gospel was not full and complete, for the time was not yet come for the perfect revelation of the work of salvation as it is in Christ Jesus, for in Him is the fulfillment of the Scriptures. Very meager was the Gospel promise given to our first parents in Paradise, and imperfect was their understanding of the fulfillment of the promise, for Eve at the birth of Cain said: "I have gotten a man from the Lord," Gen. 4, 1. expecting then the promised redemption. Meager as was that Gospel when God cursed the serpent and blessed man, Gen. 3. 15 where the Lord says, "and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel"; yet faith in that promise of God was counted for righteousness. That faith and confidence in the Word of Promise, dark as the conception of the fulfillment was in their minds, nevertheless, their faith clung to the salvation of God conveyed to them in the promise. That Word was the means by which the Spirit of God led those souls unto the Mercy Seat of God for grace and pardon. The turning of souls unto God by the Spirit through the Gospel, or rebuking sin through the Law, is the ordinary working

of the Holy Ghost in man. It is the work of regeneration and renovation, or, of conviction of guilt, but is not the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

There were also extraordinary operations of the Spirit in the Old Covenant time. Elijah raised the dead by the power given by the Spirit. Moses performed miracles and great wonders, as did many others, by divine power. Samson's superhuman strength was a gift of the Spirit. Of many men in the Old Testament it is said "The Spirit of God" or "The Spirit of the Lord" was upon them. Sometimes the Lord made special mention of individuals upon whom He would bestow a special gift of the Spirit, even the special gifts of artizans in a number of cases are mentioned in the Scriptures. When the tabernacle was to be constructed, the Lord settled the question as to who the chief workmen were to be as recorded: Ex. 31. 2-6, "See, I have called Bazaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur of the tribe of Judah; and I have filled him with the Spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting of stones, to set them, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship. And I, behold, I have given with him Aholiab. * * * * And in the hearts of all that are wise-hearted, I have put wisdom that they may make all that I have commanded thee."

Here the talent for skilled labor is ascribed to the gift of the Holy Ghost. But we also read that the Spirit of God came with gifts also unto others in higher stations of life with gifts of special power to carry out their mission assigned by God; for example, Joshua Num. 27, 18, Deut. 34, 9. Othniel Judges 3, 10, Gideon Judges 6, 34. Samson Judges 14, 6, David 1 Sam. 16, 13, Jephthah Judges 11, 29, Zechariah 2 Chro. 24, 20 and many others unto whom, it is said, God gave His Spirit. The talent and ability of King Zerubbabel in rebuilding the temple was not by his own willing or doing, for it is written, Zech. 4, 6 "not by

might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, said the Lord." These extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were not for regeneration, nor for special growth in holiness, but for power to perform certain works commanded by the Lord. Even some who were not of the elect, and some who were never converted were endowed by the Spirit with power to do some mission of the Lord. Back-sliding Saul 1 Sam. 19, 23, Balaam Num. 24, 2, and the heathen Cyrus 2 Chron. 36, 22-25, Ezra 1, 1, are among the number.

From the definitions some give of the baptism of the Holy Ghost any of the cases cited might be regarded as the Baptism of the Spirit. Neither the work nor the time was ready for the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost.

The Old Covenant faith looked forward with earnest hope for the coming of Him who should redeem Israel. All ceremonies were figures and shadows of the Messiah and His Kingdom that were to come, thus keeping the flame of hope burning in their souls. The Church of Israel was begun by the Spirit in an individual, Abraham, who by faith saw the day of Christ and was glad. Then follows Isaac; then Jacob and his family. Jacob's sons, the heads of the tribes of Israel, comprise the nation God chose for His people, to constitute His Church. This nation and Church were to prepare for the reception of the Savior in fulfillment of the promises concerning the Messiah; for the coming of the Messiah was the hope of the Old Church. Israel sighed for deliverance and awaited the Shiloh. No other nation was included in that Church organization. All other nations were rejected. Individuals were sometimes received into the Old Church from the Gentile nations, but by that Church union they became also citizens of the Hebrew nation, subject to the laws of the Jews and the obligations of the Israelitish religion, laws and customs. The Baptism of the Holy Ghost could not be administered under such conditions. Every jot and tittle of the law must be fulfilled ere the Divine Spirit would be poured out upon all flesh. The Old Church was national, but the Church upon which the Spirit would be poured must

be cosmopolitan. The Spirit led and directed the Saints of old, but did not descend upon the Old Church, as on Pentecost, when He came unto the Church of Christ with blessings for all people of all nations, of all climes and for all time to come.

The next negative consideration before us is presented in the second minor proposition.

II. The Baptism of the Holy Ghost is not the ordinary nor every extraordinary giving of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament.

The New Testament records commence under the Old Covenant regime. Besides the genealogy from Adam to the birth of our Savior, its direct records take us back into Sacred History about a year and a half prior to the birth of Christ, dealing with the people of God and the special influence of the Spirit in making immediate preparations for the advent of the Lord. There were many incidents of men being turned to the Lord by the influence of the Spirit through the preaching of John and Christ and the disciples. But before John or Jesus were born there are records of extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit, like unto some of the Spirit's manifestations in the Old Testament times. For God at that period still gave special directions to some by immediate message, sometimes by angels, sometimes by visions and dreams, and sometimes by personal address.

Unto Zacharias, the priest, came the angel of the Lord, Gabriel, bringing the welcome news that Elizabeth shall bear a son unto her husband, Zacharias. The angel not only named the child to be born, and designated the office he shall fill and the manner of his living, but he also announces (Luke 1, 15), "He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb."

After six months had passed and Elizabeth had conceived, according to the promise of the Lord, the angel Gabriel appeared unto Mary of Nazareth and announced that she is to become the mother of the Savior of the world, and tells the manner of the conception (Luke 1, 35): "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest

shall overshadow thee; therefore, also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

When Mary visited her relative Elizabeth, the unborn John leaped in his mother's womb, and Elizabeth is filled with the Holy Ghost and recognizes Mary as the mother of the Christ to come. At the circumcision of John, when Zacharias, by writing the name of his son "John" again received his speech, he was filled with the Holy Ghost and prophesied.

Then appears the aged Simeon, led by the Spirit into the Temple at the purification of Mary, and takes the Christ child into his arms and blesses Him, and acknowledges Him to be the promised Savior, for the Holy Ghost had revealed it unto him. At the baptism of Christ "The Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon Him." Luke 3, 22.

Great and glorious and important as these manifestations of the descent of the Holy Ghost are, even as mysterious to us as the out-pouring of the Spirit on Pentecost, yet these great manifestations of the Spirit are not the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, for the time is still under the Old Testament jurisdiction.

Shortly after His baptism, Christ began to preach and to do wonderful works. He gathered disciples, from among whom He chose the twelve, calling them Apostles. No special manifestation of the Spirit is recorded in calling the disciples. Christ gave them commands, and by the Word of the Spirit they were enabled to execute the behests. The seventy were sent out to preach to the people of Israel, not the full Gospel as it was afterward preached by the Apostles and preached among men to-day by the true Gospel ministers. The Old Church preached "Christ will come." During the transition period, John and the disciples of Christ preached "Christ is come." Now the glad tidings ring, "Christ has come to live forever more." The preaching in those days was as Jesus replied to John's disciples' queries, "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are

raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them; and blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me." Matt. 11. 4-6. This is what the disciples then were commissioned to preach, viz., the Messiah is come. The theme, "Christ Jesus and Him crucified," was not comprehended by the disciples at that time. When Christ told His disciples of His passion and death saying, "And they shall scourge Him and put Him to death, and the third day He shall rise again. And they (disciples) understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." Luke 18, 33-34. The Old Covenant sacrifices, and her ceremonies and her legalistic observances were yet in vogue and included in the form of religion by which Israel and even Christ worshiped God, for He was subservient unto the Law, the Mosaic as well as the Moral Law. Until that Law be fulfilled and satisfied by Christ's merits, the Spirit could not be poured out on all flesh. The Old Covenant hope seemed to have been satisfied by those who received Christ as the Savior when He came. Yet the most faithful among them did not understand that Christ must suffer and die and descend into Hell and rise again from the dead, and ascend to the right hand of the Father. The full salvation as is now declared unto us and accepted by believers to-day is a gift of grace from the Spirit, granting such joy and assurance, that those who preached and prophesied and believed and were saved prior to Pentecost could not have entertained in their souls. Salvation, in fact, was not yet completed, the righteousness which avails before God was not yet full, the penalty for sin was not yet paid, the ceremonial law was not yet abrogated, circumcision was still the initiatory sacrament, the Passover was yet the sacrificial sacrament. Until those old types and shadows should pass away, and the limits of the kingdom be no longer circumscribed by the Hebrew nation, but include men of every nation, tongue, condition and race, the Spirit could not come to pour Himself out into the assembly.

At Cæsarea Philippi, Christ says unto Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven." Matt. 16, 19, and 18, 18. But the exercise of this power was to be detained until after the fulfillment of the Scripture, for Christ speaks in the future tense. On Easter Sunday night Christ stood in the midst of the ten who had assembled behind closed doors, and "He breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." John 20,22-23. Yet the disciples did not take up the work immediately. They must first see the glory of Christ as He ascends to the Father, and must wait in Jerusalem until the promise of the Father shall be fulfilled.

Although the disciples were true men, loved the Master and trusted in Him, they understood not the meaning of His mission and work fully. They were attached to His person, and accepted His teachings in child-like simplicity, but their reasonings were faulty. When the Lord was crucified they grieved for Him as lost; when He rose from the dead they doubted. The future appeared gloomy to them. The nets were washed and mended for secular vocation. God willed they should pass through this school that they might be fully enlightened when the Spirit would be poured upon them, for at that time "The Holy Ghost was not yet given." John. 7, 39. Luther comments on this passage as follows: "At the time Christ preached He promised the Holy Ghost; therefore, the Holy Ghost was not yet given. Not that He did not exist in His nature in Heaven, but He had not yet revealed Himself, nor entered into His work. For the real work of the office of the Holy Ghost is to reveal and glorify Christ, to preach and to bear witness of Him. This office did not yet exist. The office to glorify Christ had not yet been established, that is, the preaching of the forgiveness of sins and how men shall be redeemed from death and to have comfort and joy in Christ was not known. It was unheard

of that salvation, redemption, righteousness, joy and life should be bestowed upon man through the Man—Christ. This was not known. Christ promises truly, and shows here that He is the One in whom we should believe, and that whosoever believeth shall have what He promises. But one should not foolishly think that the Holy Ghost did not exist until after the resurrection of Christ from the dead, but it says here, 'For the Holy Ghost was not yet given.' That is, He was not yet in His office, for the old preaching of the law was still in vogue, of which we often say and still preach, that we should make a distinction between the preaching of the Gospel and the preaching of the Law. For when the Law is preached it is a preaching unto the conviction of sin. It is a poor, forlorn preaching. It makes hungry souls; frightened, sad, thirsty hearts and consciences, which sigh for God's grace. This preaching should remain until Christ should be raised from the dead and glorified, and until then there is only wretchedness, thirst and want, without counsel or help. For man judges: 'You have done this; you have left this undone; you are dead and under God's wrath; which we all have experienced as we have applied it to ourselves.'

"At the time of Christ, it was regarded, that if the preaching be good, it consisted in this: 'He who would be pious and saved, must keep the Law.' But where could man obtain satisfaction, or how could those who have not kept the Law and have no works to boast of be saved? None knew. 'For the Holy Ghost was not yet given,' Christ was not yet glorified."

On Calvary's cross Christ finished the work of Redemption. He arose from the dead for our justification, as our glorified Redeemer, the conquorer of sin, death and hell, and ascended into Heaven from whence He sent His Holy Spirit unto the believers for all time with the blessings of His redeeming love.

III. *But the Baptism of the Holy Ghost is the one specific out-pouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost according to promises of the Prophets of the Old*

Testament, by John the Baptist and Christ himself and testified to by the Apostles in the New Testament.

Although the field has been partially covered in the preceding propositions, there are some points to be considered which have given rise to much discussion. Most of the enthusiasts of the emotional sects make claim of having received the baptism of the Holy Ghost at some certain time in life, through which they obtained certain power and certain assurance direct from God. Some claim that from this baptism of the Spirit they receive power to live sinless lives. Others claim that unless one has received such a specific baptism of the Spirit there is no salvation or saving grace in the person, and that such a direct and specific baptism of the Holy Ghost is necessary for regeneration. Such enthusiasts, of course, maintain that the elect in all times have received such baptism. Many of the revivalists publish, that there had been a baptism of the Holy Spirit attending the Evangelistic revivals, and that a new Pentecostal out-pouring of the Spirit had been made manifest.

To produce nervous emotional ecstasy some of the earlier erratic sects would fire guns and pistols to shock the nerves so as to imitate the rushing mighty wind and thus produce emotional ecstasy in their assemblies. No doubt, in their ignorance, they imagined this kind of religious legerdemain to be legitimate and pleasing to God. The whole system of doctrines that teach of repetitions of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost is unscriptural. The Scripture references concerning the Baptism of the Holy Ghost point us only to Pentecost. John the Baptist in describing the Baptism of the Holy Ghost speaks of the accompaniment, namely, the fire. Christ set the time within a few days, for He said: "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Acts 1, 5.

Pentecost came with its blessings of the Spirit and the disciples immediately recognized the fact that the prophecy had been fulfilled. Their testimonies were given to verify the glorious manifestation as had been promised and de-

clared. Then when Peter was preaching on the same day and many became convicted of their sins and anxious to be relieved of their burden of guilt, they cried: "What shall we do?" Peter answered: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts 2, 38. The baptism that Peter spoke of was not of an out-pouring of the Spirit as had been experienced that day by the assembly of the hundred and twenty, but he referred to the baptism with water in the name of the Triune God. The gift of the Holy Ghost that would accompany the baptism is the blessing, the merits of Christ, which always accompany the Means of Grace.

The example of the ministry of the disciples and the incidences given in the New Testament Scriptures proves conclusively, that when the command to baptize is given, that the baptism with water as instituted by Christ, insisted upon by the inspired writers, and administered by the disciples, is the baptism Christ meant when He commanded: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. 28, 19. (Acts 8, 36-37. Acts 10, 47.) Nor is this baptism to be rejected nor substituted by a spiritual baptism as is done by the Quakers, the Salvation Army and others, who claim to have a special baptism of the Holy Ghost and reject the institution of Christ. The Scripture does not allow us to change the baptism Christ instituted for something else as a substitute.

There are many examples of extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit given in the Acts of the Apostles, but when these incidences are carefully considered we learn that they are the supplement of the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost. Cæsarea, Ephesus, Samaria and Corinth were scenes where the Spirit of God exercised special influences. Cornelius received the gifts of the Spirit to speak with tongues before he was baptized. This was to convince Peter that the Spirit came on Pentecost not only for Israel but also for the Gentile world. At Ephesus, at Cor-

inth and at Samaria the special gifts of the Spirit to speak with tongues followed baptism. That which Christ promised unto the Church, namely, the peace and comfort of the Holy Ghost, did not exclude those who did not receive the power of tongues and of miracles, for the greatest gift on Pentecost was the revelation of the crucified Savior glorified. No greater gift was given the Apostles on that day, than that which the Holy Spirit tenders us through the Means of Grace in the Church now.

(*To be Continued.*)

SERMON.*

BY REV. WALTER L. SPIELMAN, A. B., COLUMBUS, O.

Text: 1 Tim. 4, 16.

My dear young Brethren, about to enter the Christian Ministry:

This evening you are celebrating the completion of your theological course in our school, where all these years you have been preparing for the office of the Holy Ministry, which office you have chosen for yourselves, and to which choice God has set His seal by the calls extended to you through His Christian Church.

The calling which you have chosen is a grand and glorious one, the highest on earth. As ambassadors of Heaven's King, you are to go forth into the world to herald the fact that peace has been made between God and man by the blood of the Cross, and to proclaim pardon and amnesty in Jesus' name. As co-workers with God, you are to go out and labor for the rescue of dying souls, that they may be brought to the Christ of the Gospels, in whom alone is help and healing. As stewards over the mysteries of God, you are to go out and dispense the blessed treasures of the Gospel, in accordance with our Lord's instructions, that multitudes may be enriched by His grace unto eternal life.

* Delivered at the Theological Commencement at Capital University, May 17, 1905.

But just because this is such an important and exalted calling, it is also one that is great in its requirements. No other calling on earth has more terrible responsibilities, so that we may well ask, "Who is sufficient for these things?" Not that we are to despair, but realizing the greatness of the work to be done, and the weakness of our hands to do it, we are to learn day by day to lean more fully on the strong arm of Him who has promised to be with us alway, and whose strength is made perfect in our weakness.

You have ended your course of training in this school, dear brethren, but your preparation for your life's calling is not done yet by any means. That will never be done here. This is in reality what its name implies, only the commencement of your life's real work. Hitherto you have only been shown how to prepare yourselves aright for this work, and from now on this work of preparation on your part must continue throughout life. Therefore St. Paul said to Timothy, (and his words apply to every minister,) "Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." (1 Tim. 4: 15-16.)

The Apostle, in our text, seeks, therefore, to impress upon our minds the fact that:

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTER CONSTANTLY HAS A TWOFOLD DUTY AND CONCERN.

I. *His Twofold Duty is to Take Heed unto Himself and unto the Doctrine.*

II. *His Twofold Concern is to Save Himself and Them That Hear Him.*

I. *His Twofold Duty is to Take Heed unto Himself and unto the Doctrine.*

In the few words of the text, St. Paul briefly sums up the pastoral precepts which he had given to Timothy in the preceding part of the letter; so that when we ask what

he means by those words, "Take heed unto thyself," we see from the preceding verses that he refers to the minister's social walk, to his mental equipment, and to his moral life.

If the minister is to be the leader among his people, as he ought to be, looked up to and honored, he needs to be very careful to preserve the honor of his high office and the respect of his people. St. Paul's ideal of a minister, among other things, includes that he be polite and refined, a true gentleman, in appearance and behavior.

Let him take heed to himself as to his appearance, that he be not uncouth and untidy. Without being proud and puffed up, for that is the other extreme, he is to be careful always to present a respectable appearance, so that his people may never be led to feel ashamed of his appearance, or embarrassed at recognizing him anywhere as their pastor. Cleanliness is next to Godliness. Let the minister, especially, never forget that; and let him also take heed unto himself as to his behavior among his people.

"A bishop must be blameless, * * * of good behavior, not a brawler, etc." Let him ever endeavor to be gentle and polite and refined, a true gentleman; never rude or coarse or loud or overbearing. Such behavior soon begets disrespect and disgust, and therefore goes far toward hindering and crippling a minister's usefulness and effectiveness.

These things may seem little things to mention here, but many a minister has had to learn by sad experience that they are weighty. Few pastoral theologies enter much into their discussion, because it is usually taken for granted that pastoral judgment and common sense will teach a man these things. Let us not forget this then, "Take heed unto thyself," even as to thy personal appearance and social bearing.

But still more important is it that the minister take heed to himself as to his mental equipment; and how St. Paul means this, we can also gather from his preceding remarks, where he urged Timothy to give attention to reading, and not to neglect the gift that was in him. Like Tim-

othy, you have also received an equipment to fit you for the office of the ministry. You have spent years of study at this school, where you have enjoyed the privilege and advantage of having able and conscientious teachers. All your studies hitherto were intended to equip you mentally for your high calling. To that equipment, however, you must now add daily. You must further develop it. The pump that is much used must have a well-spring to draw from; and as said before, the work of your life's calling now really commences.

Be careful, therefore, not to bury your talents. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee." Do not think, even if the people, whom you are called to serve, are of ordinary station and uneducated, that you need not study, and so you begin to rest and also to rust. Remember that you serve not only your people, but also your Lord; and nothing but your very best effort is fit for His service. When a minister begins to feel too big and too bright for his place, his place has already become too big for him. If, then, you would be householders that bring forth out of your treasure things old an new, you must give attention to reading and study.

This reading refers not simply to Church Papers and magazines and books. That is also very important and profitable, and by neglecting it, the minister only cripples his own usefulness. But especially are you to read the Word of God carefully, connectedly, meditatively, prayerfully. You are to live in that Word, that you may draw daily from its inexhaustible fullness. And in addition to that, you are to study, so that independently now, as your time permits, you may review and enlarge upon the theological branches which you have been studying, and seek to grow in theological information and effectiveness.

But most important of all is it that the minister take heed to himself as to his moral life, that he walk worthy of the Gospel; that both for conscience' sake and for the sake of his high calling he strive daily, by the help of the Holy Spirit, to lead a truly Christian life, as an example of

godliness to the flock over which the Chief Sheperd has placed him.

Not that we entertain fears about you in this regard, but alas, it does sometimes happen that even a minister falls into open shame and vice; and oh, how sad is the effect then, and how terrible is the reproach that is then heaped upon Christ and the Church!

That the ministry be not blamed, be careful to give no offense in anything, even to those that are without. The world also watches the Christian minister, so that he, even more than the ordinary Christian, needs to be exceedingly careful, knowing that "a city set on a hill cannot be hid," and that critics' tongues are ever ready to reproach. Care needs to be coupled with sanctified common sense and Christian living, that we "let our light so shine before men that they may see our good works and glorify our Father which is in Heaven."

The Christian minister's duty, however, is twofold; not only to take heed unto himself, but also to take heed unto the doctrine. What St. Paul means by "the doctrine," you know; namely the sum total of Christian doctrine, the teachings of God's Word, especially as bearing upon the Plan of Salvation. It is therefore the minister's duty to take heed that what he teaches and preaches be the pure doctrine of God's Word. He is to teach and preach the Truth. That has ever been the watchword of our Lutheran Church, and must ever be. For that our fathers battled, and for that we are still to struggle, guarding against false doctrine and error, and "contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." St. Paul deemed this admonition so necessary that he devoted considerable space to it, telling how damnable heresies would enter in; and that his prophecy was only too well grounded and true, the Church's experience in past and present teaches. How many errors and isms we have to battle and guard against! And how many ministers, who in these days, through fear or favor are weakening in this regard, need to have their knees strengthened! Watch

therefore that you preach the truth fully and fearlessly, the truth unto salvation; and therefore the truth rightly divided.

Take heed that what you preach be simple and lucid, Law and Gospel properly presented and in such plain and simple manner that none need remain in ignorance or doubt; not so obscured with flowers of speech and flourishes of oratorical effect, that the uneducated cannot understand, but presenting the way of salvation so clearly and plainly "that wayfaring men, yea fools shall not err therein." "Study therefore to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of Truth." And that requires study and application and patience and prayer. Therefore such stress is laid on this twofold duty. Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; and continue in them, faithful and steadfast, firm and abiding.

II. *His Twofold Concern is to Save Himself and Them that Hear Him.*

That the minister should be reminded that he is also a sinner and has a soul to save, might seem strange; for his very calling is the cure of souls, so that he, of all men, ought never to forget that. And yet, alas, the danger is there, and great it is, showing us thereby the very subtlety of Satan's temptations.

Much and frequent handling of dangerous things, as for example explosives, finally makes men grow careless; and the frequent performance of the same duties at last makes men perform them almost without thinking, like automatons.

In like manner, the minister, so much occupied in holy things, is in danger of becoming careless and blunted in those finer feelings of holy awe in God's presence, and of performing his duties in a perfunctory way, more as a business than with a real concern for souls. Moreover, while ministering to the spiritual needs of others, he is so

apt to think more of them than of himself, and, alas, sometimes even to forget his own soul's needs. Even in his daily reading in the Bible, he is apt to read more with an eye looking for texts for others, than for soul-food for himself. There is danger, therefore, that the minister, while feeding other souls, may starve his own; yes, that while he is seeking to save other souls, he may even lose his own. This the minister must never lose sight of, lest while he has preached to others, he himself should be a castaway.

He can be saved only in the same way as others. He can no more save himself by his own works or efforts than can any other poor sinner. Your high office will avail you nothing in this respect, neither will the personal sacrifices which you may make, nor the accomplishments which you may have. You must be saved by the same grace which you minister to others, by the same faith in the same Lord Jesus, worked by the same Holy Spirit, and through the same Means of Grace. Holding close and daily communion with God through the Word and Sacraments, and clinging by faith to that same Savior to whom you point others, be truly concerned about your own souls also, "working out your own salvation with fear and trembling." (Phil. 2: 12.)

But the minister's concern is also twofold, not only to save himself, but also to save them that hear him; and the more he is concerned for the salvation of his own soul, the more will he be concerned for the salvation of the souls entrusted to his care. He will realize then, all the more, that his calling is not to entertain and please people, as many nowadays look upon the ministry, not to tickle the ear and please the fancy, but to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth. That will guard him, then, against the folly into which so many modern ministers fall, of attempting to preach something new and striking and sensational, of lecturing on Shakespeare or Dante, of reviewing daily happenings, or of discussing political or society events, rather than of preaching the plain old Gospel of Christ and

Him crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness.

Precious souls, dear brethren, will be entrusted to your care, and for the manner in which you care for them, you must one day render an account before the throne of God. How you are to care for them, you know; namely, by bringing them to the Christ of the Gospels in whom alone is help and healing. Moreover, to bring lost souls to this only and all-sufficient Savior, there is only one way, by plying and applying the Word and Sacraments through which the Holy Ghost works and sustains saving faith. Use these mighty means which the Lord sends you to administer. Deliver the saving message which He has given you in His Word, like John the Baptist, laboring for no honor or reward for yourselves, but solely that the Lamb of Calvary may be glorified in the eyes and hearts of your hearers, and that by faith they may lay hold upon the salvation wrought through His blood.

Go forth, then, in Jesus' name, to your respective fields of labor in His service, and may His presence and blessing accompany you and abide with you alway; and when your work at last is done, whatever else you may have accomplished, may this be the main thing, and true of you all, that by God's grace you have saved both yourselves and them that heard you. Amen.

THE PASTOR'S PASTOR.

BY PROF. A. PFLUEGER, A. M., COLUMBUS, O.

Every Christian is in need of the services of a pastor. That is the chief reason why Christ instituted the pastoral office. As the sheep of the Lord's pasture we all need a shepherd's care. That the congregation should have a pastor is evident enough. How about the pastor himself? Does he also stand in need of a pastor? We claim that he does. He, too, is a poor sinner and often is sorely in

need of the consolation which it is the business of a pastor to give. He should therefore have some one to whom he can make known his troubles and confess his faults and sins, to the end that he may receive absolution and consolation. For his own sake, as well as for the sake of his congregation, he cannot afford to do without the services of a pastor and confessor or to leave the impression that he thinks the ministerial office to be necessary for others but not for himself. According to Walther's Pastorale (p. 168), every minister ought to choose for himself a special confessor, to whom he should confess regularly for the purpose of receiving absolution. "The preacher also needs this important means, and how can he expect and demand that his hearers should reverence the holy office of the ministry, if he seems to attach but little importance to it himself?" Like priest, like people. If the minister wishes to avoid the appearance of indifference to the importance of his calling, he should make use of the same means as he asks his parishioners to employ.

But the question may be asked: May not the pastor be a pastor to himself? We answer that he may, when it is impossible for him to have some one else. He can apply the same means to himself that he applies to others. When he confesses the sins of his congregation he can and should include his own. When he pronounces the absolution to his people he can also apply it to himself. When he consoles others, he can also console himself. The consolations of the Gospel are for all who will accept them, whether they are spoken from the pulpit or read in the study. All this is true; and yet it is better for the pastor to receive the means of grace at the hands of another whenever it is possible for him to do so. God's order is always the best, and it is God's order that faith should come by hearing. There is a special blessing connected with the hearing of the Word. Absolution usually has a deeper and more lasting effect if it is spoken by another. Hence a pastor should not depend entirely upon his own ministrations when it is possible for him to obtain the services of a fellow minister.

The main question, however, which we wish to discuss in this paper is: May the pastor administer the communion to himself?

As this question has received ample treatment at the hands of our older writers, we shall quote freely from their works. We begin with Luther as the first and greatest of our theologians.

In the Smalcald Articles he says: "But if any one should advance the pretext that for the sake of devotion he wishes to administer the communion to himself, this is not in earnest. For if he would commune in sincerity, the sacrament would be administered in the surest and best way according to Christ's institution. But that one commune by himself is a human persuasion, uncertain, unnecessary, yea even prohibited. For he does not know what he does, while without the Word of God he obeys a false human opinion and invention. So too, it is not right (even though the matter were otherwise plain) for one to use the public sacrament of the Church for his own private devotion, and without God's Word and apart from the communion of the Church to trifle therewith." Book of Concord, page 314, Jacob's Ed.

It might seem to some that, to judge from these words of Luther in our Confessions, it is the teaching of our Church that a pastor has no right to administer the communion to himself. But we have no right so to interpret Luther's words; for he is referring to the so-called private masses as celebrated in the Romish Church.

Commenting on this part of our Confessions, John Benedict Carpzov writes: "This must be understood rightly with reference to the custom of self-communion. For although (1) the fifth Canon of the Council of Toledo is not sanctioned by our Church, which canon maintains that it is absolutely necessary that the presbyter who administers the communion to others should also hand the elements to himself and always commune at the same time; although (2) it is also true that the Council of Trent has

decreed, Sess. 13, Chap. 8, that it always was customary in the Church of God for the priests who administer the eucharist to administer it also to themselves, and that this custom as handed down by apostolic tradition, must by right be retained; nevertheless (3) this custom is not absolutely rejected in our churches as if it were in conflict with the essence of the Lord's Supper. . . . . Therefore (4) these words of Luther in the Smalcald Articles must be understood according to their special reference, namely, with respect to such a communion in which the celebrant of the mass institutes a private communion which he has in common with no one, so that the consecrator is the only receiver. It is therefore one thing to administer the communion to oneself also when it is being dispensed and distributed to others; it is a different thing to administer the communion to oneself alone with the exclusion of others. Not the former, but the latter Luther here rejects, as we also reject it at present." Quoted in Walther's Pastorale, pp. 200-201.

This explanation is sustained by Gerhard and our other theologians. That they are warranted in their interpretation is evident from Luther's words written in 1523: "Then let him (the pastor) administer the sacrament both to himself and the people, while the Agnus Dei is being sung." Opera X, 2760.

Martin Chemnitz says in his Examen, p. 340: "I do not regard it as opposed to the essence of the institution of the Lord's Supper, if the minister who administers the communion to others himself also eats of that bread and drinks of that cup, especially since we have the support of the examples of the ancient Church. This, however, is done in a simple way without superstition in our churches. But that the custom, as having come down by apostolic tradition, must necessarily be always observed, cannot be proved. And things are not to be imposed upon the conscience as necessary which have not the command of God in Scripture."

It will be noticed that Chemnitz agrees with Carpzov.

While our theologians are all of the same mind with reference to the right of self-communion on the part of the pastor, they by no means regard it as worthy to be made a normal condition in our churches. It is to be resorted to in cases of necessity only. If a pastor is so situated that he cannot have the services of a ministerial brother and would otherwise be deprived of the holy communion for too long a time, let him, as Dr. Geberding says, "When all the rest have communed, kneel at the altar and reverently administer to himself, and so commune with the congregation of which he also is a member. If, however, he can have the assistance of a neighboring pastor of his own faith and confession, so much the better."

John Gerhard says: "If a village pastor, on account of the remoteness of his location, is unable to summon or go to his neighbor, let him, after first searching and examining himself and praying God to forgive his sins, take the body and blood of the Son of God, not as from his own, but from the hand of Christ."

In a note on this passage John Fred. Cotta says: "A minister of the Church ought not to administer this sacred feast to himself, except in case of necessity, lest he should give cause for offense to the weak."

Quenstedt's words on this subject are nearly the same as those of Gerhard, and need not be quoted here.

In Geo. Dedekenn's *Thesaurus Consiliorum et Decisionum*, one of the best of the casuistical works produced by our theologians, we find the following opinion expressed by the theological faculty of Wittenberg: "For the true use of the Holy Supper a giving and a reception are necessary. It is also properly maintained that the communicants should receive the sacrament from their ministers. It would also be better, no doubt, if the ministers should receive the Holy Supper from one another. If, however, the custom has obtained in a church for many years that the pastor, when administering the communion to others, administer it also to himself before the altar, we

cannot call it wrong to retain such custom in order that those who have lived according to it for so many years may not be troubled in their consciences and others be offended. For we cannot see that it belongs to the integrity of the sacrament that one person dispense and another receive it; since the question here is not about the giving and the receiving, but about the manner of giving and receiving, which in this sacrament, other things being equal, can also take place in one person without detriment to the sacrament, provided said person is otherwise authorized to administer the Supper and such manner of communing is customary among the ministers of the place."

In Loescher's *Unschuldige Nachrichten* of the year 1720, the question under consideration is discussed at some length by a Koenigsberg theologian, from whose article we translate the following:

"In the first place, there can be no doubt that it is better, if a minister can make use of the services of another to have the Supper administered to himself, that he avail himself of such services, for that is the more orderly way and all manner of evil can thus be prevented. One can also go to the Holy Supper with much greater satisfaction, if one has confessed one's sins to another pastor and thereupon has received absolution; for a pastor also needs comfort in his official duties, vexations and other matters, the same as a layman, which comfort he cannot apply to himself as well as it can be done by another pastor. Nevertheless this is not absolutely necessary, as if, in case another minister cannot be present or at least not without detriment to his work among his own people, a pastor should not be allowed to administer the communion to himself. For this latter does not in any way militate against the institution of Christ, who merely requires that there shall be a giving and receiving, but does not expressly command that one person must give and dispense and another take and receive. The giving and receiving is one thing, the manner of giving and receiving is another. The priests in the Old Testament when they sacrificed gave a part of what remained

of the offerings to those who had brought them, but retained a part for themselves and used it. Thus Samuel gave Saul a portion of the offering which he had sacrificed to the Lord, but he also ate of it himself. 1 Sam. 9, 24. The children of Israel themselves also took the manna, which was a type of the Holy Supper (John 6, 29; Luke 10, 3), and one did not ask another to put it into his hands or his mouth. Besides, many among the ancient teachers of the Church were of the opinion that Christ also first partook of the Holy Supper and then distributed it among His disciples, as Irenaeus writes: "Coming to His passion on this account that He might preach the Gospel to Abraham and to those who shared the inheritance with him, when He had given thanks He took the cup, and when He had drank of it, He gave it to His disciples, saying, Drink ye all of it, this is my blood of the New Testament. . . . Therefore ministers, since they also are human and fallible, do well to go to another when they wish to take the holy communion, in order that they may the better satisfy their own consciences, and to have him examine them and administer the holy communion to them, provided they can have the services of another; but if this cannot at all or not readily be done, it is sufficient for them to confess their sins unto God and thereupon, after adequate examination, to administer the Holy Supper to themselves, until they can obtain the services of another pastor. For necessity knows no law."

Of course, where it has not been customary for the pastor to administer the communion to himself, the congregation ought first to be instructed in regard to the pastor's rights in such matters according to the Word of God and the doctrines and practices of our Church. This is necessary in order to avoid the appearance of introducing innovations and unwarranted customs. Here, as everywhere, let all things be done decently and in order.

What has been said should convince us that a pastor ought not to resort to the practice of administering the communion to himself except in case of necessity. As the

communion is usually celebrated in connection with the meetings of our Synods and Conferences our pastors have an opportunity to receive the Lord's Supper several times every year at the hands of a brother minister. For the sake of this great advantage and privilege, even if there were no others, no pastor should, without weighty reasons, remain away from the meetings of his Synod and Conference.

Another way in which one may at times avoid the necessity of administering the communion to oneself is to call in the assistance of a neighboring pastor. Such assistance may be reciprocated to the advantage of all concerned.

If the various opportunities are embraced which the circumstances of our pastors afford, it will not be necessary for many of them frequently to administer the communion to themselves. Let each pastor make full use of his opportunities and be fully persuaded in his own mind that his practices are in harmony with the will of God and conducive to the upbuilding of His kingdom.

THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

BY PROF. M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, O.

On the 25th of June, in the year of our Lord 1530, the Evangelical Lutherans presented their great Confession at the Diet of Augsburg. The rosy month of June suggests many pleasant memories, both temporal and spiritual. Some of these pertain to the great work of our salvation, and, like Pentecost, must always be first in the thoughts of Christians. But so intimately related to all that concerns the welfare of our race in time and eternity is the great Confession of Augsburg, that some of us at least cannot but recur to the great event when its anniversary comes in June. We desire to remind our readers of the treasure which they possess and propose to furnish some facts and thoughts which may stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance.

I. Before the Diet.

In consequence of the ninety-five theses which Luther posted up at Wittenberg, on October 31, 1517, a great religious agitation arose. The act was simply that of an unpretentions monk who had become aware of glaring evils existing in the Church, and desired to remove them. They had obstructed his own official work as pastor and professor, and he thought himself in complete harmony with those in authority when he published his propositions and invited to their discussion. He had no thought of making trouble in the Church, and least of all did he desire to attack the pope and the bishops, whose jurisdiction he fully recognized. That by the grace of God, and under His guiding providence he was to become the great reformer, who should lead the people of God out of the house of bondage and bring about the restoration of the Christian Church to its original purity and blessednes under the Gospel, never entered his mind. He was humbly loyal to the existing ecclesiastical powers, and desired only the correction of some palpable evils which he thought inconsistent with the purpose and ordinances of the Church. Apparently his act had, in his eyes, nothing of the greatness which history has shown it to embody.

But in the plan of God, in whose hands the Wittenberg monk was a willing instrument, the matter had a different aspect. The act of seemingly small significance was the beginning of a mighty movement which we call the great Reformation, and which was not of Luther's devising nor of his execution. It was a work which originated in God's counsel of wisdom and mercy, and was executed by God's power and grace.

Luther's theses had special reference to the traffic in indulgences, at which many hearts were incensed and to which they were prepared to give an interested hearing. The conditions were such as to secure for them wide attention, and soon the whole land of Germany was aflame from the little spark. The question of indulgences involved principles which were recognized as momentous. That the Church possessed a treasury of merits which is available

for others than those who acquired them, and that on the basis of these merits she might remit penalties imposed on offenders, was not denied. The whole corrupt system, of which the indulgences granted for a pecuniary consideration were a part, was not yet manifest to Luther's mind when his theses were published, and only as the subject engaged the thoughts of Christians with ever increasing earnestness did the truth become clearer and the corruption of the papal Church more manifest.

The need of a reformation was incontrovertible. Even Romanists admit this. Not only was spiritual life, where it still existed, at a low stage for lack of the means to give it power and promote its growth, but moral corruption prevailed throughout the whole community. Even the clergy were steeped in depravity. Nay, it was in the highest circles of the Romish hierarchy that Satan reigned supreme, so that the saying became common that, if there was a hell, Rome was built upon it. Such crimes as history reports of popes and cardinals would have disgraced heathenism even in its most lustful days. But the moral depravity, which at times sank into the unnatural and beastly, was not the worst feature of the times preceding the Reformation, although it is difficult to conceive a lower depth into which humanity may fall. The terrible condition seemed irremediable, because the only possible remedy was itself adulterated and rendered powerless, or even poisoned and rendered powerful for evil. When corruption appears in the community there is hope for better times as long as the Church applies the regenerating and sanctifying grace which she possesses in the means committed to her trust; for God can still help where all human help has failed. But when the Church herself is involved in the degradation and woe, whence shall deliverance come? No argument is more absurd, ensnaring as it is to the unwary, than that which Romanists have advanced and still urge even in our enlightened days against the Lutheran reformation, namely, that our fathers should have pursued the way of order in opposing the abominations of their time and thus have avoided the calamitous revolution in which

their course resulted. They desire then, first, to make the false impression that the reformers plunged thoughtlessly into the work of saving souls from the tortures under which they were writhing, without any reasonable regard for the divinely constituted authorities by which God, who alone rules in the universe, designs to remedy arising evils and furnish the necessary help; and, secondly, to make the no less false suggestions that if the proper course had been taken the end in view could have been attained without the uprising and upheavals which the history of the Reformation presents. But it is an utterly false assumption that Luther and his co-workers disregarded existing authorities and made no effort to enlist them in the cause of the Christian people who were suffering under the devil's oppression. Luther was so little disposed to enter upon the world's historical stage as a reformer that, with the simplicity of a child, he began his work in the assurance that he was doing the Roman Church a service when he published his theses. He confidently expected the pope's approval, and hoped that by his intervention the indulgence business, which was giving so much offense and doing so much injury, would be stopped. So honestly did he act upon this principle that his conduct is even made the basis of a charge of inconsistency against him, inasmuch as he denounced a system which was conducted by papal authority while he professed loyalty to the pope. He himself gives expression to his mind when he says, later: "I had got singly and inadvertently into this dispute; and, as I could not draw back, I not only gave way to the pope in many important articles, but willingly and very honestly reverenced him. For who was I, a miserable, despised monk, then more resembling a corpse than a living man, that I should oppose myself to the majesty of the pope? Those self-confident spirits, who afterward attacked the pope with great pride and presumption know but little of the sufferings and inflictions which my heart experienced during the first and second year, and of the not pretended or imaginary but real humility in which I then lived." The very thing which adherents of the papal church censure Luther

for avoiding he at first did to an extent that made him amenable to the charge of half-heartedness in his devotion to the Gospel truth and of cowardly and servile subjection to the lordly ecclesiastics who usurped all power. It was only because God ruled over all and the Reformation was His work that it did not come to naught by weak submission to the usurpers who claimed to be the Church and to have all power in their hands. The thought is preposterous that a dispute which involved the very foundation on which the proud papacy rested, and therefore its very right to exist, should be referred to that papacy for adjudication instead of referring it to the great Head of the Church Himself, who has spoken and still speaks to His disciples by His Word, graciously committed to us in the Holy Scriptures.

The humble monk, whom the Lord had chosen for the mighty work, was not long in the field where the battle raged with ever increasing force until it became plain to him that submission to the pope would be a surrender of the Gospel and a calamity to the world which that Gospel alone could save. Luther was strongly tempted and suffered much, but the Lord gave him light and strength, and he surrendered nothing.

The publication of the theses stirred the whole religious world. It was time for the Lord to work, for they had made void His law. Everywhere people were led to think of the evils besetting them, and many hearts were opened to receive the Gospel truths and were led to hope for the dawning of the day. Gradually the truth became clear in the minds of thousands, that popery with its traditions and decretals and ordinances, to say nothing of its regal pomp and ceremony and proud oppression of the Christian people, is not the Church of Christ's institution—the Church of the living God, which is the ground and pillar of the truth, as the controversy became warmer and light increased on the controverted topics, large numbers embraced the Gospel and an evangelical party was formed by the Spirit of God, who works through the Gospel. That which distinguished them from others who professed Christianity was their firm con-

viction that the Word of God alone teaches and decides what is to be believed and what the conscience is bound to observe and do, and that the great central truth revealed in this Word is salvation from sin and death, not by works of righteousness which we have done or may do, least of all when these are done in compliance with merely human ordinances, but by the sacrifice of the Son of God, who became man in order to take the sinner's place in the fulfillment of all righteousness by obedience unto death, even the death of the cross, all the benefits of which sacrifice the Holy Spirit applies to individual souls by faith, that being justified by faith they might have peace in believing through our Lord Jesus Christ. It was the old doctrine of the Gospel, but entirely new to the dignitaries of the Roman Church, who had grown fat on the human contrivances substituted for the simple truth in Jesus and who, with all their powers, resisted the Gospel and denounced it as a rebelious innovation. Rome sought in vain with all the mighty forces at its command to suppress the Gospel of the grace of God in Christ, and the evangelical body grew daily in numbers and wisdom, and the grace of God was upon it.

At first the pope, Leo X., feeling his power and accustomed to have all other powers submit to his will, made rather light of the commotion in Germany, and therefore, in 1518, merely addressed a note to the Elector of Saxony, Frederick the Wise, saying: "We command you to see to it that Martin Luther be brought into the power and jurisdiction of the Holy See." But the Elector declined the office, and, as all the means employed to silence the monk proved abortive, the pope in 1520 issued a bull declaring Luther a heretic and excommunicating him if he did not recant within sixty days, at the same time ordering all governments in Germany personally to arrest Luther and deliver him to the pope as a prisoner. Instead of recanting, however, the humble professor, who had continued his study of the Holy Scriptures and saw with increasing clearness the abominations of popery, burned the papal bull in the presence of a large concourse of people and thus publicly renounced all

allegiance to the pope and the Romish Church. The papists were enraged, but Luther was not deliverd into the hands of the tyrant at Rome, and the Gospel continued to spread and the evangelical party to grow.

Then, in 1521, came the famous Diet at Worms, before which the Emperor Charles V. summoned Luther to appear. Notwithstanding the warnings and entreaties of his friends, he obeyed the summons, and on the 17th of April presented himself before the Diet. It was required of him that he should recant his writings and submit to the pope and the councils. On the following day he gave his decision, closing with the ever memorable words: "Since your most Serene Majesty and your High Mightinesses require from me a clear, simple and precise answer, I will give you one that shall have neither horns nor teeth: I cannot submit my faith either to the pope or the councils, because it is clear as the day that they have frequently erred and contradicted each other. Unless, therefore, I am convinced by the testimony of Scripture, or by the clearest reasoning, unless I am persuaded by means of the passages I have quoted, and unless they thus render my conscience, bound by the Word of God, I cannot and will not retract; for it is neither safe nor wise to do anything against one's conscience. Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise; God help me!. Amen." "Thus spoke a monk before the emperor and the mighty ones of the nation," says a historian of the Reformation; "and this feeble and despised man, alone, by relying on the grace of the Most High, appeared greater and mightier than them all. His words contain a power against which all these mighty rulers can do nothing. This is the weakness of God, which is stronger than man. The empire and the Church on the one hand, this obscure man on the other, had met. God had brought together these kings and the prelates publicly, to confound their wisdom. The battle is lost, and the consequences of this defeat of the great ones of the earth will be felt among every nation and in every age to the end of time." For it was the triumph of the great Head of the Church over

a proud and pretentious host that had usurped His authority and used it for the oppression of His people.

But the conflict did not end with the victory of the gospel at Worms, and the time had not yet come for the promulgation of an Evangelical Confession which should unite and identify the Evangelical Lutheran Church in distinction from the corrupt Church of Rome. The Romanists in their rage were intent upon destroying Luther and his followers. The emperor, on the day following Luther's appearance at the diet, ordered a message to be read in which he declared: "I am about to dismiss the Augustine Luther, forbidding him to cause the least disorder among the people; I shall then proceed against him and his adherents as contumacious hereties by excommunication, by interdict, and by every means calculated to destroy them." Luther had no fears, for he knew himself under the protection of the Almighty. But his friends feared for his life and secretly brought him to the Wartburg, where he could abide in safety. There he busied himself in translating the New Testament into German and thus performed one of his greatest works for the promotion of the Evangelical cause, which no power of pope and princes was capable of stemming. The threatened extermination by violence was not realized. Some of the papistic estates endeavored to execute the emperor's decrees and persecutions of Lutherans took place, some even unto death. But circumstances under the good providence of God, were unfavorable to a general massacre of Lutherans even in the states whose rulers were devoted Papists, and some of the most influential rulers, like the Elector of Saxony, were no longer Papists, but believers in the Gospel which Luther and the Lutherans preached. The ferocious edict of Worms was therefore practically a failure, and Christ's kingdom of truth gained daily victories among the people, withstanding the strenuous efforts of Rome to crush it.

The religious troubles became a feature in the political movements of the time. Popery, with its inherent distrust of the divine power of the Word to govern the Church:

and its reliance upon physical force to compass its ends, naturally resorted to political schemes and intrigues to maintain its ascendency and enforce its demands, and rulers who had learned that the pope is not their political lord were forced to protect their lands against violence. The commotion increased from year to year and in 1529, and at the diet of Speyer the papal party succeeded in passing a decree that the edict of Worms, which at a former diet at Speyer, held three years before, had been suspended until the assembly of a general council to be convoked within a year, should now be enforced until the proposed council could be held. The decree forbade all persons to join the Lutherans and all preachers were commanded to teach in accordance with the doctrines and regulations of the Church of Rome. That the princes and estates that had accepted the gospel declined to accept such a tyrannical edict needs scarcely be mentioned, and when it was insisted on that they must submit to the majority, they solemnly protested. Thus the believers in the Gospel obtained the name of Protestants, an honored name which belonged originally to the Lutherans alone, but which has often been abused by those who have no other claim to it than that, like the Lutherans, they oppose popery. In their protest the evangelical princes and estates give their reasons for refusing to accept the Decree and say, among other things: "The new edict declares that the ministers shall preach the Gospel according to the writings of the Holy Christian Church. We think that for this regulation to have any value we should first agree on what is meant by the true and holy Church. Seeing that there is great diversity of opinion in this respect, that there is no sure doctrine but such as is unforvable to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; that this holy Book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness; therefore we are resolved, by the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of His Word alone, as it is

contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testament, without adding anything thereto. This Word is the only truth; it is the one rule of all doctrine and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God. For these reasons, most dear lords, uncles, cousins and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we *protest* by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Savior, and who will one day be our judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for ourselves and for our people, neither consent nor adhere in any manner whatsoever to the proposed decree, in anything that is contrary to God, to His Holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of our souls, and to the last decree of Spires." It was a noble *Protest,* worthy of the Christian men whose heart had been won by the heavenly truth of the Gospel which they so simply and so firmly confessed in the following year at Augsburg.

All things were now tending in the direction of that great confession, which marked the official entrance into the world's history of the distinctive Protestant Church called Evangelical Lutheran. It was not another than the Christian Church, which the papal hierarchy claimed to be, that was thus brought into view. The evangelical believers called attention in their famous Protest to the misleading employment of the word Church in the recess of the diet. They were heartily willing to teach in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of Christ, if by this were meant the doctrines which Christ, the Head of the Church, sets forth in His Word for its guidance, but not if it were meant to bind on their consciences the commandments of the papal party who pretended to be the Church and arrogated to themselves the Lord's authority. They would conform to all the requirements of the Church of Christ, but not to all

the human impositions of the Church of Rome. It had become clear to the people who studied the Scriptures that the Church is the Communion of Saints, as all Christendom confessed in its Creed, and that those who abide in His Word are the people of God. To those the promise is given that they shall know the truth and the truth shall make them free. These constitute the Church of the Living God, the ground and pillar of the truth. Everything was tending now, under the providence and grace of the great King in Zion, to gather those together who had become one in faith around one confession, in which that faith should be declared to the world with new clearness and fulness and energy, and which should be the symbol of the true visible Church gathered around the pure Word and Sacrament as distinguished from the Roman Church, which had corrupted its way under papal domination, and from all other ecclesiastical organizations that departed more or less from the law and the testimony laid down in Holy Scripture.

The emperor received the Protestants ungraciously and treated them as prisoners when their delegation submitted to him their decision. That the papal party was in power and had the prestige which attaches to superior numbers was manifest. This gave them in the eyes of the world a great advantage. They not only prided themselves on it, but in their carnal-mindedness even supposed that this gave them the absolute right to rule and imposed on the minority the duty to obey. Neither the emperor nor the pope was sufficiently enlightened by the evangelical truth to appreciate the rights of human conscience and individual faith, and very probably the emperor, who in general was disposed to act reasonably and do right, sincerely thought it but reasonable and right that the Protestants, seeing that they were in the minority, should submit their judgment to that of their opponents, who were greatly in the majority. When the truth of supernatural revelation and the divine power which it exerts upon the soul is not appreciated, it is not difficult to understand how even men of just disposition, on the human basis of civil righteousness, can come to the conclusion that a

modest man will not set up his opinions against a multitude, and that the fact of his stubbornly doing so renders him dangerous to the community and justifies repressive measures even to the extent of violence. Men who know no higher authority than that of man's judgment cannot otherwise than regard the voice of the majority as decisive in points of disagreement. The emperor probably did the best that he knew when he insisted that the Protestants must obey the decree of the diet, because that was the decision of the greatest number. But that was not the best that the Lutherans knew, as they had learned in matters of faith and conscience to appeal from all human judgments, whether of kings or beggars, popes or peasants, learned or unlearned men to God, who has given us a revelation for our enlightment where all human reason fails and caused that revelation to be written for our learning in the Holy Scriptures. They appealed to a heavenly court, where men have no voice, and therefore human majorities as well as minorities count for nothing. In the assurance of their faith that they stood upon the ground of eternal truth with God on their side, they protested and resolved to stand by their protest, whatever consequences might come. They were with God and God was with them, and they had the faith to be confident that all was well. When we think of this heroic faith of our fathers we have reason to blush at the remembrance of our fear in controversies that are past and the contemplation of our vacillations and concessions and sinful subterfuges of the present, all of which reveal our littleness of faith and our shameful degeneration as children of the Reformation. Lord, will Thou not revive us again?

The emperor's reply to the Protestant decision led to negotiations looking to a defensive alliance on the part of the Lutherans; but the call issued by the emperor for a diet to be held at Augsburg in April of 1530 for a while allayed the rising tempest. The conciliatory tone of this call had a soothing effect. It was mild beyond all expectation. The emperor had evidently received information that bade him pause in his proposed persecution. The summons to the con-

vocation at Augsburg stated as one of its objects, in regard to the existing religious differences, to hear and consider, in love and kindly concern, the opinions of all parties, to seek an agreement in the Christian truth, to obviate all misunderstandings and to put away all wrongs.

When in March of that year the Elector of Saxony received the emperor's call for the diet, he at once, by the advice to his faithful chancellor, Dr. Brueck, commissioned his theologians at Wittenburg, Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen and Melanchthon, to prepare a statement of the chief points of the evangelical doctrine, that it might be well understood what the Protestants must maintain at the convention and how far they could, with a good conscience, enter upon any agreement with their adversaries. This statement was to be delivered to the Elector at Torgau with the least possible delay. As Luther had already at the end of the previous year carefully noted down the most important points in a paper known as the Schwabach Articles, these were taken as a basis for the work, thoroughly considered and revised, and additions made in regard to existing abuses. The result was then presented to the elector at Torgau, on which account the document was called the Torgau Articles. These the theologians proposed to present as their confession at the approaching diet, desiring to screen the good elector from danger to himself and his country; but he replied to their suggestion: "God forbid that I should be excluded; I will with you confess my Lord Jesus Christ." The preparations having been duly made, the elector with his retinue started on his journey and on May 2 reached Augsburg, being the first of all the princes to enter the city, where one of the most momentous assemblages in the world's history was to be held, and where in the following month the Lutherans read the carefully and prayerfully prepared declaration of their faith, which is known in all the world as the Augsburg Confession. Thanks be to God that He inspired noble men to do the noble deed, and blessed be His name that to this day He has preserved the Church of the Augsburg Confession that is made glad by the Gospel

which cheered their hearts and made them ready to sacrifice all that is dear on earth to preserve the dearer hope of salvation in heaven. And this glorious Church of the Augsburg Confession, while it prizes above all price the grace and the truth which is its precious heritage, and while it gives all glory to the Lord who blessed them and blesses us with the same grace unto salvation by the glorious gospel which they confessed and we confess, does not forget the mighty men who suffered hardness to secure not only for themselves, but for their children and their children's children the blessings of the gospel, which announces pardon and peace to sinners, who have and can have no other hope. We will not forget the grace of God which gave to the world the great men of the Reformation, whose noble deeds of faith and heroism gave us the Augsburg Confession. God who saves us by His grace, works also by His providence in the same love and to the same end. Our appreciation of His goodness embraces the instrumentalities of His government of the world as well as His means of grace committed to the Church. It is but a one-sided view of the divine government to confine our observation only to the Church with its administration of the means of grace. Unquestionably there is no hope of salvation outside of these, the divinely appointed means for its attainment. But the Lord rules over all, and if in the historical development it seems that natural reason is the potent factor, the goodness and mercy of the Creator and Governor of all must never be overlooked, as He makes all things work together for good to them that love Him and makes even the wrath of man to praise Him. It is ignorance of this divine government of the whole universe by which the Lord of heaven and earth makes all things tributary to the accomplishment of His purposes, that makes so many a history of men and nations and of the world such an unintelligible jumble of facts without a meaning and therefore devoid of all human interest. The Reformation was a wonderful work of God, and Luther and Melanchthon and other prominent men in the great movement were His instruments. It was not a

fatalistic plan carried out in disregard of the creative design to let the human will have the decision in respect to matters subject to its jurisdiction, but a plan of salvation by grace, to the execution of which the whole government of the world should be directed, without the least conflict with the primal design of man and his creative endowment and dominion. God chose His servants for the great work of the Reformation, and by His grace they nobly performed the task assigned them. We will not forget their labor of love, as we will not forget the grace and mercy of God, by which they were enabled to proclaim anew the Gospel which gave them peace and brings peace to us. Glory to God in the highest, who through the Reformation proclaimed again the peace on earth by the Gospel of the grace of God in Jesus Christ our Lord, and with the renewed power of faith gave us in such simplicity and beauty the Augsburg Confession! Will we not hear it?

A STUDY OF LUKE 23, 34.[a]

BY REV. F. W. ALMENDINGER, CANAL WINCHESTER, O.

"And Jesus said: Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."

The above words constitute the first utterance of Jesus Christ on the cross. They break a long and painful silence, and are therefore of concern more than ordinary, unto them who find an interest in Him. All through His trial and crucifixion, that travesty of justice which stands out without a rival in the history of the human race, He whose life and deeds all the time squared with justice and righteousness maintained a silence that becomes most painful. To correct Pontius Pilate who in the mad course that he pursued with Him, had become presumptous as to his power over Him and to affirm His kingship over the Jews does He essay to speak and break the silence that He had maintained. All the way from Gabbatha

to Golgotha He bears the cross in silence. Only to the weeping women who follow Him does He address Himself. So now when they crucify Him there is no outcry. Whether the Evangelists tell us all that He said while He was on trial or hanging on the cross cannot be positively stated; yet the probability that they did is very great. The silence which He maintained and the conduct which He preserved from Gethsemane until He gave up the Ghost would at least justify putting faith in such a hypothesis. His conduct here comports with the spirit of His life and is in harmony with His work and utterance at every turn.

St. Luke alone records this utterance just like some of the other words uttered on the cross are recorded by only one of the Evangelists. This is not strange, but in the study of the word it is quite a factor, for it stands forth without a parallel which might throw some light on it. From the nature of the case and circumstances under which it was uttered it is clear that no parallel could exist, for the crucifixion and death of Jesus Christ have nothing anywhere to compare with them. Noteworthy is it that the first utterance on the cross is a prayer. This might have been expected especially from Him who had shown such a spirit as Christ did all of His life. But it is not offered in behalf of Himself but of mankind. Now for whom among them? Beyond controversy for them who nail Him to the cross. However is it confined to these? The case would suggest not. The soldiers indeed nail Him to the cross, and so commit a gross outrage on a loving God. "What they do." They crucify His Only-begotten, Well-beloved Son. It is the masterstroke of all sin which might well have been awaited at the hands of Satan, but which man should scarce have been expected to conspire to. Yet the soldiers are not masters of the case, but are under authority and as they receive the command, "Do this," they do it. True, they derided and mocked Him when He was once given over into their power. But this does not indicate that they were filled especially with envy and hatred against Him, there being other cases on record where they treated their victim in a

similar manner. Whether their treatment of Christ and His crucifixion at their hands was the result of especially malicious motives on their part or not is an unsettled question at any rate. It all appears rather as the result of especial instigation of Satan, and from every point of view has the earmarks of Satanic art. But this does not eradicate guilt. Pontius Pilate delivered Christ unto them that they should crucify Him. But he was persuaded against his will and prevailed upon by the Jewish rabble who were influenced and driven to their course by Priests and Levites, Scribes and Pharisees. Now that these are all embraced in this intercession of Christ is evident from principles which He taught. He says: He that hateth his brother is a murderer. Yea from His principles it is evident that he that loveth not his neighbor as himself falls under condemnation as such. Before His just and righteous eye the hater is as much a transgressor of the law of love as was Cain who slew his brother Abel. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all." James 2, 10. (R. V.)

But again, does this prayer include only such as are in some way implicated in the act of His crucifixion? Does not the Evangelist intend rather to refer to all mankind when he has Jesus say, "forgive *them?* αὐτοῖς instead of τούτοις is found in the original. They correspond in signification to the Latin *eis* and *his* respectively. This term would include not those merely who are now engaged in crucifying Him, nor those also who betrayed Him and clamored for His death, but as many as whose sin brought Him into the world and whose atonement and redemption required His death. Accordingly He bears here on the wings of prayer the heathen world that was all unaware of His coming into the flesh as also the millions then yet unborn. This also throws light on His argument with the Father, "they know not what they do." These words can much more readily be applied to the Gentiles and them not yet born than to the Jews as a nation, to Priest, Levite,

Scribe or Pharisee, or even to them by whose hands He hangs on the cross.

This is a High-priestly prayer in the fullest sense. In a larger measure than elsewhere do the elements of high-priestly functions show themselves here. Instruction, prayer, blessing and sacrifice are here vieing with each other. The High priest of the Old Testament covenant once a year on the great day of atonement entered the Holy of Holies to sacrifice for the sins of all Israel. In connection therewith he prayed for forgiveness for all Israel. This is all typical. It finds its Antitype at Calvary; Jesus Christ is the High priest for all men. He offers sacrifice for all men. With this sacrifice He enters into the Holiest of all. He is here at once High priest and sacrifice, Mediator and Advocate for all men. Now the antitype must be true to its type. That the Great High priest by whom all sacrifice is finished might be the antitype of that of the Old Testament covenant He must pray for as many as for whom He makes sacrifice. It is evident then from the nature of the case that this prayer is offered, not for some individuals in particular, or for a certain class, but for all mankind.

"Father forgive them." What is the sense of these words? What thought are they to convey? Certainly not this that God should take no further account of their sins for whom Jesus pleads than simply to blot them out of remembrance. Nothing could be further from the import of the words of Jesus Christ than this idea, nor would anything militate more against the truth of Revelation. Such a thought in these words would annul the work which Christ is now completing. Christ never counts Himself out of His work. If there is anything that He insists on above all others, it is Himself as the heart and center of the plan and scheme of God underlying forgiveness of sin and of salvation. It would certainly not dare to be assumed that the element in the plan of salvation of which so much is made at every turn in its development, and without which salvation is declared an impossibility, and which in Christ's work of

redemption is the basic factor, He would set aside in this moment. Christ does certainly not count Himself out of consideration when forgiveness of sin comes under view. There is no indication that the law of righteousness was ever suspended. "I come not to destroy, but to fulfill." Matt. 5, 17. But His fulfillment and he who shall enjoy the advantage and blessing accruing from His work must stand in a certain relation to each other. This is the *sine qua non* to forgiveness. The import of the words then is: that God might deal with them in mercy, i. e. delay visiting iniquity and give them a day of grace wherein they might hear the Gospel, learn the truth, repent and believe. For this purpose He sends out His disciples commissioning them to use the means of grace. That the Father would richly bless this work in sending the Holy Spirit who should work in their hearts who hear and have the sacraments applied unto them. "Sanctify them through Thy truth." The import of the words is work faith in them, for where there is faith, there is forgiveness; where faith is wanting there positively can be no forgiveness.

"Forgive them, for they know not what they do." These words express what seems almost inpossible, namely that they should not know Jesus Christ. The doctrines which He had taught and the miracles which He had wrought gave conclusive evidence concerning Him. These they had heard and seen. The centurion who had no more than these doctrines and miracles beheld the conduct of Him on the cross and exclaimed: "Verily this was a righteous man, the Son of God." But the soldiers did not know Him as the Christ. Neither Pilate nor the Jews knew Him as such. Peter declares (Acts 3, 17.) to the Jews in Solomon's hall: Now brethren, I know that in ignorance ye did it as did also your rulers, and Paul (1 Cor. 2, 8.) writes; "which none of the rulers of the world had known; for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory." Hence Jesus says here, they know not what they do.

However on this point not all the testimony of the Scriptures is so clearly on one side. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, a Pharisee, says: Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles, that thou doest, except God be with Him. An admission that not only he but other rulers of the Jews with him shared in this knowledge and conviction. Jesus declares to the Jews. (John 7, 28), Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am, and (John 15, 24), If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father. And (Matt. 21, 38) the husbandmen are presented by Himself saying, They said among themselves: This is the heir, etc. In all of these citations there is reference to a knowledge of Jesus. But there is a great difference the knowing of Him which is chiefly intellectual as presented here and that of which He speaks (John 17, 3) This is life eternal that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. Of this spiritual manner of knowing Him Christ evidently speaks on the cross.

"*For* they know not what they do." This seems to hold up ignorance as a ground for forgiveness. But the particle γάρ, is used here to present not a ground for action, but as an argument to influence action. From the analogy of faith and from plainly enunciated principles of Scripture it is evident that the particle is used here as an argument to influence action. It needs to be noted too, that Christ marks out here that the sin against the Son of man is not mortal. This seems to have quite a bearing on the wording of this prayer. But were Jesus presenting ignorance as a ground for action pure and simple, He would set aside all plain teaching with reference to forgiveness of sin and would contradict His teachings and practice hitherto. The groundwork of forgiveness is this: Without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sin, Heb. 9, 22. But from the fact that Jesus Christ shed His blood for the remission of sin it does not follow that all sin will be forgiven.

That is the basis upon which it can be done. The plan on which it is actually carried out includes faith in the heart of the individual, not ignorance of the sins that he commits, and such faith alone will be sufficient as appropriates the merit and righteousness of Jesus Christ and presents them unto God. Along this line Jesus Christ moved in all of His practice in His public ministry. (Cf. such passages as Matt. 9: 1-8; 9, 22; 9, 28; 15, 28. Mary 5, 34, Luke 7, 50.)

"They know not." The ignorance here referred to, whilst presented in the appeal for mercy, does not render guiltless. It does not blot out the sin. All unrepented and unremitted sin condemns, yet between sin and sin there is a difference. Not that one is a transgression of the law of righteousness and the other not, but the measure of guilt is greater in the one case, in the other less. Jesus Christ taught this. "That servant which knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required." Luke 12: 47-48. The man that lusteth after a woman and he that lives in open adultery with her are both transgressors of the same law of chastity; but evidently the former is guilty of adultery in a less degree than the latter. Yet before God lust will condemn as readily as the fleshly deed. So of those who had to do with the crucifixion of Christ, the soldiers who had heard little or nothing of Him are shedding innocent blood, for which Priest and Levite, Scribe and Pharisee sought. Both transgress the law of love. Yet the latter who beheld His works and heard His gracious words are guilty in a greater measure than they who carry out the order given them from those who are in authority over them. But of all these like of all mankind Jesus says: They know not what they do. Yet to all alike repentance and faith is the only avenue of escape from damnation.

NOTES.

THE "PROFESSOR QUESTION" IN PROTESTANT GERMANY.

The "Professorenfrage" has become the leading practical church problem in Protestant Germany. It springs from the fact that the theological professors at the universities in many cases have through their scientific researches reached conclusions, also in the fundamentals of faith, such as the Scriptures, the Person and the Work of Christ, which are recognized at all hands as in decided opposition to the official confessional statutes of the Church, which they too have sworn to observe in their teachings. In this way they turn out candidates of theology whose faith is not the same as that of the congregations which they are to serve. Against this the Church at large protests. Various territorial Synods, notably those of Brandenburg, Schleswig Holstein, and the Rhine Province have petitioned the government to appoint theological men whose doctrinal position is that of the Church at large. The state has yielded in so far that it has appointed conservative men to the universities where liberal theology held absolute sway. The "Straffprofessoren," so-called because they are appointed as a punishment for the liberal professors and against their will, are found in Bonn, Markburg, Heidelberg, Tübingen and elsewhere. The government, however, refuses to deprive those liberals who already hold chairs of their positions, because it is the fixed policy of the authorities, in the interests of academic "Freedom of Research" — to have both "tendencies," the conservative and the advanced, represented in the theological faculties. The Prussian state has departed from this rule only in one case, and that in the interests of the conservatives. In Greifswald there is not a single liberal man, but there is no Prussian university in which conservatives are not represented. Much was expected by the Church at large from the last General Synod of Prussia, the largest and the most influential church body in the country; but the outcome of its deliberations were something of a disappointment. The

tenth commission had proposed that the Synod petition the government "not to call theologians who deny the fundamental facts of salvation and the revealed character of the Holy Scriptures and the fundamentals of the Church." The Synod, in which the university men were present in goodly number, refused to accept this motion, and the modified form, which asks that the Church consistory be consulted in the calling of these men, was accepted only by a vote of 127 to 57. Among the negative votes were those of such conservative men as Court Preacher von Dryander, of Berlin. It is the position of these men that the various schools of theology must fight out their own battles solely on the merits of their cause, without the interference of the state authorities. In the meanwhile the Church suffers much under the blight of university rationalism.

WOMAN'S COLLEGES IN GERMANY.

When the Universities of Germany began to admit women, a leading objection to receiving them as regularly immatriculated students was the fact that they could not present a *testimonium maturitatis* from a regular nine year secondary school, and as a consequence, until recently, only Heidelberg and Freiburg really admit women on an exact equality with men to immatriculation and examination. In all of the other universities they are merely "hearers." To remedy this matter a number of associations and societies for the advancement of women's interests, notably the national "Frauenbildungs-Reform" undertook the establishment of secondary schools or colleges for women, with courses leading up to the regular universities, and the first "Mädchengymnasium" was opened in Carlsruhe in 1893, with an enrollment of 24 pupils. Unfortunately those in control could not agree fully upon the management of the school and the attendance gradually dwindled down to 16 in 1898. Fortunately the state authorities, as the duchy of Baden took the lead in the German confederacy in the matter of the higher education of

women, then assumed control, and as a consequence the attendance is now 83. The discouragements of the Carlsruhe venture did not prevent other organizations from undertaking similar work, and it was not long until secondary schools for women were opened in Berlin and Leipzig under the auspices of the "Frauenstudium Verein," which has a membership of 2,000. These schools as well as the majority of those founded later have arranged their courses according to the scheme of the "Reformgymnasium" found in Frankfurt, Altona and a few other cities, the chief innovation in which is a substitution of a six year classical course for the traditional curriculum of nine years in languages, the first three years being devoted entirely to scientific studies. It is claimed with confidence by the friends of the movement that these Reformgymnasiums have not only stood the test but that they furnish a better preparation for the professional studies in the universities than do any of the old-fashioned nine year curricula in the gymnasia, the Realgymnasia and the Oberrealschulen. At present there are fourteen regular women's colleges in Germany, namely in Carlsruhe, Berlin, Leipzig, Baden-Baden, Koenigsberg, Hannover, Stuttgart, Breslau, Munich, Frankfurt a. M., Hamburg, Cologne, Schoeneberg and Charlottenburg, this being also the chronological order of their establishment, the last three having been opened since New Year. Of these only two, those in Koenigsberg and Munich, have adopted the full classical course. The total attendance is about 500; the courses range from four and one-half to six years according to the requirements for admittance, all however leading up to the university. The tuition is lowest in Baden-Baden, where it is 72 marks per annum, and highest in Frankfurt, where it is 300 marks. The lowest age of admission is twelve, the highest required is sixteen.

In the meanwhile the universities have not known exactly what to do with the women that apply for admittance. Until lately, only Heidelberg and Freiburg, the two territorial institutions of Baden, had opened their doors wide

to women students, permitting them to immatriculate and to graduate. Within recent weeks the authorities of Bavaria, the most Catholic and the most conservative country in the German confederation, has surprised the friends of the higher education of women in Germany by admitting women on equal condition with the men to its three universities at Wurzburg, Erlangen and Munich. Prussia, however, remains stubborn in admitting women only as "hearers" or "hospitants" and hence permitting them to take a degree only as a special favor. It requires the special permit of the Rector and of the professor in charge to even permit a woman to attend a lecture course. The Prussian authorities have made it so hard for women to enter the universities that the attendance of this contingent within a twelve-month has decreased from fourteen hundred to about half that number. The bulk of the women flock to Berlin, where more than two-thirds of the woman student body of Germany is found, being attracted there doubtlessly by the excellent teaching force. It has been statistically proven that the great majority of these women do not seek a degree but are preparing themselves for a teacher's position in the secondary girl schools. Their interest in university work is not scientific but the bread and butter advantages. It is very doubtful if further privileges will be granted at the universities to these applicants.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXV. OCTOBER, 1905. No. 5.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

HONEST RATIONALISM.

Rationalism in itself is bad enough in theological thought, but what makes it worse is the fact that it is generally dishonest. This dishonesty consists in the fact that it claims that the Scriptures, rightly interpreted, say what it teaches. It claims to reproduce Biblical thought. Such was the general character of the Rationalism of the past and down to the immediate present. The never-ending struggle between faith and non-faith in Christian theology from the days of the Apostles to our own has always produced a rationalism that made the dishonest claim of teaching the truth of the Scriptures. The opponents of Christ and of the Apostles, in their doctrine of justification by the works of the law, maintained that they represented the teachings of Moses and the Prophets. In the Trinitarian and Christological controversies in the early church Arius and his people protested loud and long that they taught Biblical principles and the same was true of Pelagius. In the days of the Reformation the anti-Trinitarian Socinians would not admit that their tenets were contrary to the Scriptures. When the vulgar Rationalism of a century and more ago devasted the fair fields of Evangelical faith and interpreted all the supernatural miracles, including the resurrection of Christ, as purely natural processes, they claimed that they had really discovered the true teachings of the Old and New Testament writers. Even down to the higher criticism of our times the rationalistic perversion of the Scriptures has insisted that it has at last discovered the real character and development of

the religious development described in the Scriptures, and that the blunder of the evangelical thought since the days of the apostles had consisted in this, that this process had been regarded as a supernatural and not as a natural one. In the entire history of the Church rationalism has not only corrupted the teachings of the Word, but it has also been dishonest in maintaining that its tenets were the exact expression of the Biblical facts and records.

Now this is changed and we have at last an honest school of rationalism that is willing to confess that its teachings are *not* in accord, at least with the bulk of the New Testament, especially not with the ideas of Paul, although it does claim that its purpose is to bring back theology to the original teachings of Jesus Himself. This is the new historico-religious school (religionsgeschichtlich), which purposes to explain the origin and development of the Christian religion on the basis of the common and current religious ideas prevailing in the better class of Judaism in the days of Christ. Hence it becomes necessary to eliminate from original Christianity every element that would necessitate a divine revelation or a supernatural character on the part of the Lord. Harnack declared in his famous, or rather infamous "Essence of Christianity," that Jesus does not constitute an essential part of the gospel He proclaimed. He did nothing but declare the love of the Father to mankind that doubted His love. All that the New Testament attributes to Christ as a necessary factor and condition for the attainment of this love, such as His divine nature, the atonement, etc., are regarded not as a part and portion of Christ's own proclamation, but were added by His disciples, especially Paul, so that the question is seriously asked, if Jesus or Paul is the author of the evangelical theology which has obtained in the Church since the Apostolic days.

This type of rationalism, which is perhaps the worst that has appeared in the annals of the Church, is honest enough to confess that it cannot by hook or crook make the New Testament say what it teaches. It avowedly antagonizes the Christology of John and the atonement theory

of Paul and rejects them both, on the ground that they represent teachings foreign to the original declaration of Jesus Himself. The bulk of the teachings of the New Testament books, except those features of the Synoptics which can be explained as natural phenomena and can be made to speak of Jesus only as a man and at best as a religious genius, are directly rejected. It accordingly openly rejects what it recognizes as New Testament teachings and does not try to pervert these to suit its own taste. It is a very bad, but in this respect an honest, rationalism.

CHRISTIANITY "HISTORICALLY" INTERPRETED.

The representatives of modern "advanced" theology protest loud and long, when the charge is made that they have discarded all the fundamentals of Christianity and that theirs is no longer a "Christian" theology. Yet how true this charge is can be seen from a recent work of one of the most brilliant protagonists of this school, Professor Gunkel, of Berlin, who in his recent work entitled "*Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verstaendnis des Neuen Testaments,*" gives the following account of the genesis and character of Christianity "historically" considered. We reproduce it here not only as a curiosity of "theological" literature, but also in order to show how deep the chasm is that separates this "theology" from everything that is Biblical and Christian. Gunkel in substance says:

The religion of the New Testament, both in its origin and in its development, has, even in essential points, been under the influence of foreign and strange religions, these having exerted this influence through the medium of Judaism. Not only the Old Testament, but also the New is to be interpreted in the light of their relation to other religions. These foreign religious influences that were felt in the New Testament religion were not chiefly those of Greek thought, but were rather the oriental creeds and faiths. The hesitancy of such men as Harnack and Wellhausen to accept this hypothesis, on the ground that in this way the strong personalities that appear as active agencies in this religious development, are too much crowded into the

background or reduced to insignificance, must give way to the facts in the case. Since the Persian period a type of culture and civilization prevailed in Western Asia that was essentially Babylonian in character and made use of the Aramaic as an international world language, and this was accompanied by a marked mixture of religions. Even before the days of Alexander the Great this had produced the Gnosticism of the East, together with a pessimistic philosophy, a deep-seated need of salvation, an ascetic morality and the hope of immortality. Here already a divine being in the role of a Redeemer held a conspicuous place. This is the idea that influenced Judaism most, and was assimilated to a marked degree in the period of the Prophets, and was renewed during the exile in a more crude state, as is seen especially in the Eschatology and the Wisdom literature of this period. Side by side with the Pharisaic Monotheism, Particularism and Nomism, is found in the Apocalypses a syncretistic tendency, that develops its cosmology, angelology, its ideas of the original state of man and the world, its hopes of Messiah and a mass of mythological teachings in reference to the resurrection, Paradise, Hell, the End of the World, etc. This type of syncretistic faith at a later period to a large extent was discarded by Judaism, but was retained by early Christianity. While in the gospel of Jesus only the Eschatology strikes us as a foreign element, it is evident that immediately after His death all kinds of religious syncretistic notions found their way into the congregations. Thereby already in the teachings of Paul and of John the doctrine of Jesus gets to be a system of redemptive facts, the centre of which is Christ. New Testament Christology is not a new production of Paul, but only the application of the idea of a Redeemer found among the Jewish syncretists to the crucified Jesus. This Christology is a hymn in honor of Jesus, in which, according to heathen precedent, person and principle are identified. In Jesus the Sonship of God, the Atonement, the Victory of Life has been realized. Among the elements in the New Testament religion that go back to heathen myths are the visions of John with the seven torches, the

twenty-four elders and the four ways of life (originally astral divinities), the new Jerusalem (originally nothing else than the heavens with the milky way); the child of the sun woman (a myth of the young sun god, who overcomes the winter); the book with the seven seals (originally a book of sorcery, the interpreter of which was described as a God). In the gospel accounts of the childhood of Jesus, especially the birth from the virgin, the flight to Egypt, the story of His baptism and temptation, the miracles of Christ with inanimate things, His ascension (originally one way of representing the sunrise), the descent to hell, the resurrection on the third day (originally like the restoration to life of Jupiter and of the Servant of Jehovah, a picture of the return of Spring in the revival of nature), the observation of the Sunday, which in the Mithras cult has its parallels taken from the same source — in all these this same factor is found at work. In the Epistles of Paul the doctrine of baptism as the sacramental union with the Savior, who puts himself into sympathetic communion with His people, originally comes from the Osiris mysteries. Only one conclusion can be drawn, namely, that the original Christianity of Paul and John (but not the gospel of Jesus) is a syncretistic religion, the necessary product of the development of the religious mind of mankind, but at the same time "the incomparably unique spiritual movement, to which mankind owes the best that it possesses." It signifies "a new epoch in the history of mankind." The author, in his Introduction, emphasizes his claim that he has not "been influenced by a sensational desire for novelty," that he is "a son of the church, who knows of no higher aim than by his scientific researches to serve the Christian congregation."

It is only natural that this radical reconstruction of Christianity should meet with sharp antagonism of the conservatives. Among others this opposition is voiced by Professor Barth, of the University of Bern, in the Beweis des Glaubens (Literary Supplement) No. 10. He says:

A sharp distinction must be made between facts and the interpretation of facts. It has been proved by recent

research that a large number of ideas and customs which formerly were regarded as the sole property of the revealed religion in the Scriptures are a common possession of Israel with the Persians, Egyptians, Babylonians and Indians. How is this to be explained? Gunkel invents the method of the old Christian Apologists and declares that the Christian teachings were taken from the heathen. But what perfectly unreasonable combination he is compelled to make use of in order to prove his hypothesis! They are chiefly the work of imagination and a wild phantasy. A cool, sober second thought will pass a different judgment.

The same method in an important detail Biblical problem is applied by Dr. W. Heitmüller, of the University of Goettingen, who published a book of nearly 350 pages on the interpretation of the single phrase "In His Name" ("Im Namen Jesu"), which he explains on the basis of the sanctity ascribed to the names of the gods by the Babylonians, Persians, Mandaens and in the religious syncretism of the Roman empire in general. From these data the author declares that a magical effect was ascribed to the name of Jesus by the earliest Christians, which accordingly easily found its way into the baptismal formula. In reality a superstition underlies the Biblical use of this term.

Sapienti sat!

REFORM IN CONFIRMATION.

In the Protestant churches of Germany the present method of confirming a child at about the age of fourteen and making this confirmation a condition for admittance to the Lord's table, is being vigorously discussed and a thorough reformation in this respect is called for. In many centers the conviction has gained ground that the present confirmation practice is the weak spot in the activity of the ministry and the greatest danger to the upbuilding of the Church. Dr. Stöcker, the famous ex-court preacher of Berlin, and a tower of strength for the conservative Church of Germany in general, declares that the present practice is "the organized destruction of the Church." He declares that this practice "has degenerated through

hypocrisy, legalism, vanity and worldliness, and it is rotten down to the roots and [in the state churches with their compulsory confirmation] is an enforced sinning against liberty of conscience and of faith." He declares it is eternally wrong to demand of a fourteen-year-old boy or girl a final and intelligent decision on the most intricate matters of faith and confession, and in the nature of the case the confirmation confession of such a boy or girl must be a mere lip statement or hypocrisy. "Already on the day of confirmation the child is made a liar."

Accordingly a reform is demanded, which is to consist, first of all, in a separation of confirmation from participation in the Lord's Supper. An enforced partaking of Communion, such as actually takes place to a greater or less extent in connection with every confirmation, is contrary to the spirit of the gospel, and, it is claimed, "will poison the religious life of the child in its very roots." Stöcker asks that confirmation be made merely the solemn closing of the religious instruction of the youth and is to be regarded as the evidence that the baptismal promise has been kept. Confession and vow are to be separated from confirmation; and only later, when the confirmed inwardly feel the longing for the Lord's Supper, are they to go to the table of the Lord with the consent of the pastor and the vestry, who are to testify to the worthiness of the candidates, and then the proper confessions and vows are to be made.

Just what will become of this movement is not yet clear, but certain it is that the demand for it touches a very sore spot in the life of the Church, as every pastor can attest from his own experience. It is all the sorer here in America, where only so few congregations have good Christion schools and only too often the religious training is left to the tender mercies of inefficient Sunday school teachers. If ever a pastor is compelled to stretch his conscience it is in connection with his confirmation. Here is a practical problem that is a "burning question" and could be profitably discussed by our conferences and synods.

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

BY REV. M. R. WALTER, LOUDONVILLE, OHIO.

(Concluded.)

IV. *The out-pouring of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost was the coming of the Spirit into the New Covenant Church with increased measure to exercise His office in bestowing the merits of Christ upon believers.*

Christ came into the world to save sinful man from temporal and eternal ruin. This salvation is for all the children of Adam who are under the curse of the Law. But the Holy Spirit is the executive of the Godhead who through the Word imparts grace and faith unto men that they may believe on Christ and receive the gifts of the merits of the Redeemer. Even the disciples on the early morn of Pentecost did not have comfort and peace and consolation won by Christ's life and death and resurrection and ascension, for the Holy Ghost had not yet been revealed unto them, although they were regenerated and children of God. Legalism and Judaism were still prominent in their souls. They were waiting, longing, sighing, anxious for the redemption from the bondage which fettered their minds and troubled their consciences. While Christ was yet with them their hearts were glad, because of the love He manifested for them. They at that time were unable to appreciate the blessedness of Christ's merits rightly, because the influence of the Old Covenant doctrines left them in shadows and led them unto the servile fear of the Law.

Luther in commenting on Joel 2, 28 says: "Now follows further the prophecy of the Holy Spirit. We have a trustworthy witness in Saint Peter, the Apostle, who says that the prophecy was fulfilled on Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended from Heaven and filled the hearts of the Apostles and those that were with them, so that they spake with tongues and in strange languages, which they before did not understand, nor had learned, and gave great power

unto the Apostles, witnesses of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, who were, before they had received this heavenly gift, frightened, meek and disheartened, so that they not only did not venture to teach and to preach, but dared not leave the house and be seen.

"This word 'Ausgiessen'— pour-out — is rightly explained and understood, by a great overflow and abundance. For the Word, which heretofore had been found only in a little corner of the Jewish land, through which the Holy Spirit had enlightened and guided the hearts of the Saints, or believers at all times, so now the Gospel shall be preached through the Apostles in all languages, and in all lands, and the Holy Spirit shall also be given to the heathen."

In explanation of the same text, "Die Hirschberg Bibel" comments:—

(*a*) (The time.) "In the last days, as Peter interprets in the New Testament, Acts 2, 17, this which is here prophesied was truly fulfilled by the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost.

(*b*) (Administrator.) "I, the Messiah, will pour the Holy Spirit in richer measure upon all flesh that will receive Him; Jews and Gentiles, without regard to the age.

(*c*) (The gifts.) "These expressions are taken from various Divine Revelations in the Old Testament, and show, that in the New Testament not only at the beginning such extraordinary gift in richer measure is to be found in believers, but that subsequently, also, the common Christian, through the ordinary means of illumination of the Holy Spirit, should have as clear a knowledge as the prophets in the Old Testament had."

The power to speak with tongues and perform miracles was by no means the most important blessing on Pentecost, nor the main gift of the Spirit that day. The merits of Jesus Christ, the crucified Savior, the now glorified Son of God, ascended to the right hand of the Father, the Redeemer from sin and eternal perdition, is the great gift of Pentecost. As Jesus says: "He (The Spirit of Truth) shall glorify me: for He shall receive of mine and

shew it unto you. * * * That your joy may be full." John 16, 14 and 24. The riches and possessions the Lamb bestows upon His Bride, the Church, is what was given the Apostles and their companions on Pentecost to make their hearts glad and to give them boldness to stand up for Christ. That gift of Christ through the Spirit was not confined to Pentecost, nor to the few people who lived at that time. The Spirit came to bring the same blessings unto the entire Church of Christ, commencing the glorious work on Pentecost in a mighty out-pouring which has continued to flow with blessings in the Church, the souls of believers, until now, and to continue unto the end of time. The Spirit came to the Church, not to the world. He pours out the Gospel comfort in the hearts of believers only, not into the masses, and through His mission the flow of blessings shall continue to comfort and strengthen and preserve the Church unto the end; and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church of Christ. (Matt. 16, 18.)

The spiritual blessings showered down in mighty streams on Pentecost, were for all times, for the Spirit came with the gifts of Salvation, comfort, joy and peace into the Church never more to depart, nor to withdraw the gifts our Savior has won for us. In writing about the gifts of prophecy and visions foretold in Joel, Luther says: "But what are these gifts all together, compared to this gift, that the Spirit of God Himself, the Eternal God, comes down into our hearts, yea, into our bodies and dwells in us, and governs, guides and directs us; as St. Paul states with clear words: 1 Cor. 6, 19, 'Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?' So then, what this passage of the Prophet includes with prophecy, dreams and visions are one thing, namely, the knowledge of God through Christ, which the Holy Ghost enkindles and keeps burning through the Word of the Gospel." On the day of Pentecost the new order of things began in the kingdom of God on earth, and that day has been fittingly called: "The Dedication Day of Christ's Church of the New Covenant."

Luther further says: "By sending the Holy Ghost through the preaching of the Gospel on Pentecost, Christ began to be known to the World." In speaking of the gift of the Spirit as promised in the Old Testament prophecy concerning Pentecost, Luther continues: "This gift is truly in the New Testament. Although after this prophecy, in times following, there was no lacking of the gift of prophesying and predicting; yet this is to be estimated far inferior to the gift of which the Prophet here speaks. For the true knowledge of God's Son brings with it the knowledge of the Father, forgiveness of sins by the Holy Ghost, who governs, guides and directs us—that we give not room to temptation, nor have sin rule over us—and preserves us in victory; in a word: It gives us life Eternal."

Although the Fathers in the Old Covenant were saved by faith through the light of the Word then given them, and the saints who died during the life of Christ, Simeon, Anna, Joseph and others, were saved by the light of the Gospel then shining for them; yet to-day the Jew is not saved, although he holds to the religion of Old Israel. Nor are people saved now who do not apprehend by faith the mercy of God revealed in Christ's life and death, accepting the Gospel now revealed as the power of God unto Salvation. Life and Salvation is the precious inheritance of the Church as we confess: "Outside of the Church there is no Salvation." Salvation can be found only in the Church, the Bride of Christ. Salvation is hers because the Holy Ghost bestowed it upon her. The Church still has her Treasures. She has never been deprived of them. She must retain them or she can no longer be The Bride of Christ. The new Covenant Church was established on the Day of Pentecost, when the Spirit came into the Church with the merits of the glorified Savior to remain to the end and to enter into every soul that is born of the Church by the new birth conferring the same spiritual gifts, the merits of Christ and the power of faith, that made the disciples' hearts glad on Pentecost. The Apostles were saved by the faith implanted in them by the Holy Ghost

through the Word. They received the joy and peace of the Gospel. But they are no more saved, the gifts of the Gospel are no more theirs, than the humblest and most obscure of God's Children to-day. The humblest of Christians to-day is God's Child by virtue of the merits of Christ apprehended by faith. Great and important as was the calling of the inspired Apostles, their salvation was assured in no other way then by faith in the Redeemer.

In the Old Covenant there were types of Christ, High-priests, priests, paschal lamb, scape goats and the like. Vaguely did the people of old make the application of the true signification of these things. The old things have passed away. Old sacrifices have been annulled and Christ has become the sacrifice once for all. Calvary has become the common Altar of Christianity. The high-priests' office has been changed since Christ has assumed the office, made the sacrifice acceptable to God and in the Holy of Holies at the Throne of God makes intercessions for us as the Great High Priest. The priesthood, too, has been changed. Now the priests in the Christian Church are the believing members of Christ's Church on earth, who present their bodies a living sacrifice (Rom. 12, 1), as St. Peter says: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people," 1 Peter 2, 9.

When did this new order of things commence? When the Old Covenant obligations ceased at Pentecost, when the Spirit of God was poured out upon the assembly in a mighty stream which still flows on with blessings and gifts won for us by Christ.

Dr. Walther writes in a sermon on Pentecost as follows: "The Holy Ghost did not commence first to operate on the first Christians on Pentecost. For the Holy Ghost not only moved the Holy men of God in the Old Testament who spoke and wrote, but everything that is good in the hearts of men after the fall is the work of the Holy Ghost. During the first four thousand years He operated secretly, but on the first Christian Pentecost He finally issued forth from His concealment, came audibly in the rushing mighty

wind, appeared visibly in the form of fiery tongues and then revealed His divine power and glory by the distribution of the glorious, wonderful gifts unto people of every nation that are under the heavens. Had the Holy Ghost before only sprinkled like the dew of heaven, to-day He pours Himself out in mighty streams. Had He before had His workshop almost exclusively among the chosen people of God, the people of Israel, He now declares His workshop to be the entire human race in every zone under the heavens.

"Why was the Holy Ghost only then first poured out? It is to show that we human beings, for the exalted divine gift of the Holy Ghost, must be thankful only to the redemption won alone by Christ; that it was only complete through the life, suffering, death, resurrection and ascension; that we must first be in reality reconciled to the Father through the Son, before the Holy Ghost could carry on His work among men, and that, therefore, the true means through which the Holy Ghost enters into the heart of man is not the terrifying preaching from the smoking and quaking Sinai, but the Sermon of Grace from Golgotha, namely, the preaching of the deeds of God—not the condemning law of works—but the sweet and consoling Gospel of free grace in Christ."

Peter on Pentecost declares: "Having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this which we now see and hear." They heard the message of the Gospel which came as a power with life and salvation and joy and peace for the soul. For the Holy Ghost had taken of Christ and had shown it unto them, and led them into the firm knowledge of the way of salvation in Christ, as He guided them in all truth. This was done for the disciples' sake. It was done for all who would be led by the Spirit into the kingdom, as Peter said: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off even as

many as the Lord our God shall call." Act. 2, 38-39. This clearly shows for whom the Spirit is poured out. Old and young, male and female of every race and nation on earth come under the scope of the promise. None are rejected; none are excluded. All are bidden, come; "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him Take the Water of life freely." Rev. 22, 17. They that come are the children of God in whom the Spirit of God dwells. The community of those in whom the Spirit of God dwells in the Church of Christ on earth. To say that the Spirit of God does not dwell in the Church would be a denial of Scripture truth. Luther says in the large Catechism: "But how can this sanctification be accomplished? Reply: In the same manner as the Son obtains dominion, by gaining us through His nativity, death, resurrection, etc., the Holy Spirit accomplishes this sanctification, through the following means, namely, through the communion of Saints or the Christian Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and eternal life; that is, He first leads us into His holy communion and lays us in the bosom of the Church, through which He teaches us and leads us to Christ."

Were the Spirit of God not in the Church, the Sacraments and the Word could not be her heritage; absolution would be spoken in vain, the ban would have no force, and preaching would be without effect. Luther says further: "Learn, then, to understand this article in the clearest manner, so that when you are asked what you understand by the words, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, you can answer: I believe that the Holy Ghost sanctifies or makes me holy, as the name implies. But by what means does He do this? Or, what is the method and medium employed in accomplishing it? Answer: Through the Christian Church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and eternal life. For in the first place, He has His own Church in the world, which is the mother that bears and nourishes

every Christian through the Word of God, which the Holy Ghost reveals and enforces, animating and enlightening the hearts of men, so that they may comprehend and embrace it, adhere and cleave to it." *Large Catechism.*

Where Christ is to bless, His Holy Spirit is to sanctify, and Christ has promised His saints, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28, 20. Christ is always with His Church. The members of His Church form one building, united in Him by the Spirit, as the Apostle Paul says, "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. 2, 19-22. The structure here described did not always exist. It is the New Covenant Church, whose beginning was when the God-Man was glorified and ascended to Heaven. He is the Chief Cornerstone. In Him all believers are fitly framed together, builded into the Holy Temple by the Spirit. The Spirit came on Pentecost, with the material furnished by Christ, as the Master Builder. *That coming of the Spirit on Pentecost,* for the purpose of establishing the Kingdom and preserving the Kingdom by the love of the Father, the merits of the Son, and His own sanctifying power, *is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.* Every Christian, the baptized infant included, is born again "by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost" in the Church upon which the Spirit of God was poured on Pentecost and in which Church He has continued to dwell. We have the promise of Christ, "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of Truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; but ye know Him; for He dwelleth in you, and shall be in you." John 14, 16-17.

From the Confessions of our Church and the writings of the Reformers, it is evident that the position of the early Church Fathers relating to the relation of the Spirit to the Church was accepted by Luther and others. Compare, "Now while God clearly promises in the Scriptures that *the Church shall always have the Holy Spirit,* He also earnestly warns us that false teachers and wolves will insinuate themselves into the Church among the genuine ministers of the Gospel. But, properly speaking, *the Church which has the Holy Spirit is the Christian Church,*" Apol. Augs. Conf., to what Irenaeus, a pupil of John the Evangelist — and is said to represent the mind of St. John and of the Church, both in the East and in the West—says: "Our faith received from the Church, which receives always from the Spirit of God as an excellent gift in a noble vessel, always young and making young the vessel itself in which it is. For this gift of God is intrusted to the Church, as the breath of life to the first man, to this end, that all the members partaking of it might be quickened with life. And thus the communication of Christ is imparted; that is, the Holy Ghost, the earnest of incorruption, the confirmation of the faith, the way of ascent to God. For in the Church God places apostles, prophets, doctors, and all other operations of the Spirit, of which none are partakers who do not come to the Church, thereby depriving themselves of life by a perverse mind and by worse deeds. *For where the Church is, there is also the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace.* The Spirit is truth. Wherefore they who do not partake of Him, and are not nurtured into life at the breast of the mother [*the Church*] do not receive of that most pure fountain which proceeds from the body of Christ, but dig out for themselves broken pools from the trenches of the earth, and drink water stained with mire, because they turn aside from the faith of the Church lest they should be convicted, and reject the Spirit lest they should be taught." Cont. Haeret., Lib. III., Cap. 24.

Augustine wrote much concerning the operations of the Holy Ghost, and it seems that Luther accepted in general

Augustine's writings on this subject. We will quote from Augustine's sermon, "Concerning the Day of Pentecost," the following: "Therefore the Holy Ghost on this day descended into the temple of His Apostles, which He had prepared for Himself, as a shower of sanctification, no more as a transient visitor, but as a perpetual Comforter and as an eternal inhabitant. * * * He came therefore on this day to His disciples, no longer by the grace of visitation and operation, but by the very Presence of His Majesty; and into those vessels, no longer the odor of the balsam, but the very Substance of the Sacred Unction flowed down, from whose fragrance the breadth of the whole world was to be filled and all who came to their doctrine to be made partakers of God."

Gregory Nazianzen, in his discourse on Pentecost, says: "But now the Holy Ghost is given more perfectly, for He is no longer present by His operation as of old, but is present with us, so to speak, and converses with us in a substantial manner. For it was fitting that, as the Son had conversed with us in a body, the Spirit also should come among us in a bodily manner; and when Christ had returned to His own place, He should descend to us." Cyril of Alexandria says: "What then is this grace? It is that pouring forth of the Spirit as St. Paul says. Therefore, the Holy Ghost works in us by Himself, truly sanctifying us and uniting us to Himself while He joins us to Himself and makes us partakers of the Divine Nature."

Athanasius writes: "We abide in God and He in us, because he hath given us of His Spirit. But if by the presence of the Spirit who is in us we are made partakers of the Divine Nature, he is beside himself who shall say that this is done by a creature and not by the Spirit of God."

The consensus of the early Church Fathers on this question is briefly summarized in our Confessions. "He—the Holy Ghost—calls, gathers, enlightens and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and keeps it with Jesus Christ in the one true faith." *Small Catechism.*

V. The particular gifts of the Spirit, such as the speaking with tongues and the power to perform miracles, were given to the disciples on Pentecost, and also to many others afterward, in the Apostolic times, to enable the disciples to carry out the command to preach the Gospel to every nation.

The fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel concerning Pentecost was fully understood by the disciples. Peter quoted the prophecy. When the disciples were filled with the Holy Ghost, He bestowed upon them the knowledge of Christ's Kingdom, so that they clearly understood the Gospel message that Christ had preached to them and the prophecies of the Old Testament referring to Christ and His Church. It was only then that they first realized the great importance of their office as Apostles and Evangelists, and the responsibility of the commission with which they were charged, namely, to preach the Gospel unto all nations. God bestowed upon them, as a necessary equipment, the gift of tongues. Immediately they began to speak in different languages and dialects, "as the Spirit gave them utterance." The Lord had told His disciples of the power of speaking languages to be given them before His ascension, when He said, "They shall speak with new tongues." Mark 16, 17.

On Pentecost the disciples preached the wonderful works of God unto people of all nations and all languages understandingly. But this gift of tongues was not confined to Pentecost. There are numerous incidents mentioned in Acts where this gift was also given to others. Indeed, it seems that many not mentioned had this power given them for the edification of the Church at large, for St. Paul writes: "And God has set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, help, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret? But covet earnestly the best gifts; and yet I show you a more excellent way." Not all upon whom the Spirit came in that age were

endowed with the gift of speaking languages, as Paul asks: "Do all speak with tongues?" Neither do the New Testament conversions show that all received this power. God gave this power to those who should do special work in the Church, in the missionary field, among the nations speaking other languages than the language learned by the one sent. This was because God decreed that the Church of Christ should be a universal community, a cosmopolitan Church. That race, nation or language should be no barrier, but that the Gospel should go into all lands, unto all people. The Holy Spirit is to be poured out upon all flesh. Men and women are to be brought unto Christ by the Spirit through the Word. For "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." * * * "And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" Rom. 10. Preachers were sent, who preached the Word unto those who sat in darkness, but "not all obeyed the Gospel." There is no excuse, as Paul testifies, Rom. 10, 18, "But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." Rom. 10, 18. When those men went out on that mission to bring the Gospel to every nation on earth, they went equipped by the Holy Spirit, so that they could speak understandingly to those to whom they brought the Lord's message. The gift of tongues was not bestowed as an accomplishment, but simply as a medium to impart the truth unto men of different speech. The Gospel call is for every ear, the Gospel comfort is for every heart. Augustine says, in his sermon on "The Day of Pentecost": "What did the advent of the Holy Ghost accomplish? How did He teach us His presence? How did He manifest it? They all spoke with tongues of all nations. * * * One man spoke the tongues of all nations. The unity of the Church is in the tongues of all nations. Behold here the unity of the Catholic Church, diffused throughout the world, is declared. * * * Wherefore as then—*Pentecost*—the tongues of all nations, spoken by one man, showed the pres-

ence of one man, so now the charity of the unity of all nations shows Him to be here."

From the second chapter of Acts it appears that not all the hearers of Pentecost realized the miracle of speaking in different languages, for some accused the disciples of being full of new wine, misinterpreting the strange sounds of foreign languages for the babblings of drunken men. But many from different countries understood, individually, the message of the wonderful works of God, in their own language, as they said, Acts 2, 8, "And how hear we every man in our own tongue wherein we were born?" The wonder is mysterious, and beyond explanation in any way it may be regarded.

First, the different disciples severally might have spoken in different languages, that is, one addressing the people in one language, another one in a different tongue, and so on; or, secondly, the disciple might have spoken to an audience of a mixture of nationalties and languages, and yet each one of the hearers understanding in his own language the message proclaimed by the disciple of Christ. In the later interpretation it must be assumed that a miracle must have also been performed upon the ears of the hearers. From Christ's prophecy and Paul's record, this second explanation has no Scriptural foundation. Luther and a great majority of the Lutheran commentators teach that in the Apostolic times the disciples and evangelists were empowered to preach in any language the Gospel of Christ, whenever necessary to bring the truth to the understanding of people of different languages or dialects from their own.

The object of bestowing this power upon the early Church is, that, while the Church was in its formative period, all nations on earth were to have the Goscpel presented to them before that generation should pass away. The pouring out of the Spirit upon all flesh was verified by the Word being preached unto all nations in that generation. How? When? And by whom? The Scriptures have answered only in part. We must accept the statement of the inspired Paul: "Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth and

their words unto the ends of the world." Rom. 10, 18. "If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which ye have heard and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven." Col. 1, 23.

The other gifts to perform miracles are not mentioned in the second chapter of Acts as having been in accompaniment with the out-pouring of the Spirit on Pentecost, but Christ, in Mark 16, mentions the diversities of power to be given the disciples as a gift of the Spirit, as does also Paul in 1 Cor., 12. There were many examples of the disciples performing miracles in the "Acts of the Apostles." The gift to perform miracles was to the disciples than their credentials for authority in preaching Christ Jesus and Him crucified unto the world, for the days of inspiration had not yet ceased and the inspired writings were not yet complete. But here again the same divine object is in view, when the miracles were performed by the disciples, viz., the glory of God by making room to bring the Gospel of Christ home to the hearts of men.

VI. The out-pouring of the Spirit on Pentecost, and His operations in the Church at all times, are only by and through the Word of God.

The Holy Spirit has always been the Divine Executive to accomplish that which God has proclaimed unto the Church. When the Old Church was established in Eden, after the fall, God spoke directly to Adam and Eve, and gave them the first Gospel promise. That promise was like a little spark fallen into tow. The glowing was faint in the heart when that first word of the light of the Gospel enkindled hope in the bosom of fallen man. That little light would have been smothered by the cares and subtleties of human depravity had not the Spirit of God fanned that spark to glow and burn in cheering comfort in the distressed souls. So whenever the Lord gave direct message to people in olden times, the Spirit of God always accompanied that Word to accomplish the purpose of that Word.

Abraham believed the promise of God, and it was counted unto him as righteousness. Yet Abraham did not believe of his own will and accord. It was God who gave him the ability to believe by the Spirit. For Abraham rejoiced in the promised Christ, and "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. 12, 3. God also spoke directly to Isaac and Jacob and to others in olden times. But as the Scriptures were being written and read and preached the direct converse of God with man became less frequent, and only a comparative few did God speak to as face to face, or through angels. The messages of God before the writing of the Scriptures were handed down as an heirship, from generation to generation. Although these messages became traditional in character, being transmitted from father to son, they were nevertheless God's Word, the means through which the Holy Spirit operated among the people. For God's Word is not confined to particular form. The Word spoken directly by God was the medium for the Spirit to convey blessings or curses, for the Spirit conveys only that with which the Word is burdened. The Word retained in the mind is just as much God's Word as though it were preached, or read, or printed in a book, or engraved on plates of gold. The Spirit of God is with the Word at all times, to accomplish its purpose. Isa. 55, 11.

God's Word has always been the way unto salvation, commencing at Paradise, until even now, and to continue unto the end of time. Yet, Scriptures clearly teach there was a difference in the degree of knowledge and understanding of the Divine Will. The Patriarchs had truth revealed to them not known in Paradise; Israel had knowledge of which the Patriarchs were ignorant; Jesus imparted truth which was hidden from Israel. In the same manner truth not declared by Jesus was revealed to the Church by the Spirit through the Apostles and Evangelists. Even now the Spirit reveals unto us the gracious counsel of God, through the Word, so that Christians now have an understanding of the truth, as well as the Apostles had on the day of Pentecost. For it was only by the Word, through which the

Spirit operated that the disciples could accept the fulfillment of the old prophecies and of the promises of Christ. But this understanding of truth, as it is in Christ Jesus, could not be attained until Christ had ascended and the Holy Spirit had descended with permanent gifts and blessings unto the Church. These blessings were not only unto the apostolate, but unto the entire Church for all time to come. In the Old Covenant these things were hidden; now the Spirit reveals them continually unto the Church through the Word, since He came on Pentecost, as St. Paul testifies. "I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God, which is given to me for you, to fulfill the Word of God; even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations, but now is made manifest to His saints; to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory; whom we preach, warning every man in all wisdom that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." Col. 1, 25-28. This knowledge was hidden from the Fathers, but now sealed in the Christians' heart by the Gospel, as Paul further declares: "Now to HIM that is of power to stablish you according to my Gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Rom. 16, 25-26. "'Him' that is of power to stablish you" is the Holy Spirit.

The Apostle cites here that the Spirit is He who has come to "stablish" saints through the Gospel and the Scriptures of the prophets. Paul testifies also, "Now He which stablished us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." 2 Cor. 1, 21-22. That the Spirit implants faith in the heart, and preserves the Christian in grace and salvation after faith is attained is the Confession of the Church (Third Article of the Creed in Smaller and Larger Catechisms), and Scripture doctrine as it is written:

"That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the Word of Truth, the Gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of His glory." Eph. 1, 12-14.

Without doubt, the Spirit also operates in the Jewish synagogues when the Old Testament is read, who points to the Christ who has come, and here and there through the Law, the schoolmaster to lead unto Christ, He brings some benighted child of Israel into the light of the Gospel and liberty in Christ, as Paul says: "But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their hearts. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." 2 Cor. 3, 15-17.

The law written in man's heart is God's Word, and the Spirit operates through it unto the accusations of conscience and longing for redemption. (Rom. 2, 14-15.) But peace comes unto none excepting by the Gospel of Christ. The Word of God leads to Christ.

When God inspired men of old to speak in His name and write the Scriptures it was the Spirit who guided them, for "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," 2 Pet. 1, 21 and "We know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual." 1 Cor. 2, 12-13. This Word unto salvation is not natural to man but is the revelation of God's gracious will by the Spirit. The Spirit gives the Word His own stamp and seal and makes it to be a life giving power to man, for He brings the love of the Father and the merits of the Son unto believers. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are life," John 6, 63, is the testimony of Christ. The Spirit is the great

divine Teacher, for "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," John 14, 26; and without His instruction we cannot know the Savior nor believe in Him, nor come to Him.

When the fulness of time had come and the Spirit of God, proceeding from the Father and the Son, was to be poured out upon the assembly on Pentecost it was not without the voucher of the Word. The promises and prophecies of the Old Testament writers, John the Baptist's predictions and the consoling words of Christ, given the disciples before His crucifixion, and again on Mt. Olivet on Ascension Day, were the gracious testimonies vouching for the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. The comfort to the disciples was the infallible Word. They recognized and accepted the gifts of the Holy Ghost as the fulfillment of promise, which Word the Spirit used to comfort and strengthen them in the work assigned them by the Spirit. It is the Word that verified the conditions and gifts of the Spirit given on Pentecost. God's Spirit employs the same means to-day to operate in the hearts of men. Without the Word the Spirit does not come. Without the Spirit no one can believe in Christ or be regenerated, or justified before God and become an heir of eternal life. The Spirit employs no means that is not made manifest in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. This we maintain over against the Papists who teach of the infallibility of the Pope and Councils. The following are extracts taken from "The Holy Ghost and the Church" by the late Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, Henry Edw. Manning.

"Holy Scripture, known to be such, and rightly understood, is certainly the voice of the Holy Ghost, and likewise may generate acts of divine faith.

"Whatsoever tradition is found in all the world, neither written in Scripture nor decreed by any Council of the Church, but running up beyond the Scripture and the Gen-

eral Councils, is, according to St. Augustine's rule, certainly of divine origin.

"The decrees of General Councils are undoubtedly the voice of the Holy Ghost, both because they are the organs of the active infallibility of the Church, and because they have the pledge of a special divine assistance according to the need of the Church and of the Faith.

"The definitions and decrees of Pontiffs, speaking ex cathedra, or as the head of the Church and to the whole Church, whether by Bull, or Apostolic Letters, or Encyclical, or Brief, to many or to one person, undoubtedly emanate from a divine assistance, and are infallible."

The Romish doctrine is that the Holy Spirit still inspires the Pope of Rome to utter new, measures and new Gospels. Consequently all the acknowledged errors of the Popes and the Councils of the past which the Romanists acknowledge to have been made, must be charged against the Holy Spirit according to the doctrine of the infallibility of Pontiffs and Councils of the Church of Rome.

The Holy Ghost reveals nothing unto the Church now excepting what is revealed in the inspired Bible. In the Old Covenant sacrifices and atonements were made for sins by means of the old law prescription, prefiguring the Christ, our sacrifice and atonement made once for all. Now we have as a gracious heritage in the Church, the forgiveness of sins and life and salvation. The Keys of the Kingdom are hers to exercise according to the command of Christ. Absolution with its comfort is just as powerful to-day as in the days of the Apostles. The power of the Gospel to forgive sins to-day is just as perfect and efficacious, as in Pentecostal times.

God's Means of Grace are found only in the Church. The Church cannot exist nor subsist without these means, namely, the Word and the Sacraments. Where the Means of Grace are administered according to God's will and command, there too the Spirit of God dwells to sanctify and renovate and strengthen and comfort, and make alive the

souls of men that by nature are dead in trespasses and in sin. Through the Means of Grace the Spirit creates faith in our hearts, and thereby we become the children of God. By believing in Christ, His life becomes our life, His death becomes our death, His victory over sin and the grave becomes our victory. All this glory is ours, not by our merit and willing, but through the love of God sealed to our souls by the Holy Spirit, for "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Tit. 3, 5-7. Our baptismal covenant, our faith, our justification, our sanctification are all free gifts of grace given us by the Spirit, as Paul writes: "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God," 1 Cor. 6, 11 and "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Rom. 8, 14.

But the Spirit came not to reveal Himself but to bring the grace of God unto our souls, as Jesus says "When He, the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak; and He shall show you things to come. He shall glorify me, for He shall receive of mine and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine, therefore, said, I, that He shall take of mine and shew it unto you." John 16, 13-15.

Thus the Spirit came to sanctify us through the Christ by the Gospel. When Christ prayed for our sanctification, He said: "Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy Word is truth." The Truth is the medium by which the Spirit leads us unto the knowledge of God and seals our salvation. Truth is eternal. Heaven and earth shall pass away but the Word of the Lord, our God, endureth forever. The Word of Truth is the evidence given to us that the peace of God and the grace of Christ and the fellowship

of the Holy Spirit, the Pentecost blessing, shall abide with the Church until the end of time, as Jesus promises: "If ye love me, keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." John 14, 15-17.

"To God the Father, and the Son
Who rose again, be honor done,
With Him, who came at Pentecost,
The Comforter, the Holy Ghost." — LUTHER.

THE FINALITY OF CONDITIONS IN THE FUTURE WORLD.

BY REV. F. W. ROHLFING, CARROLLTON, OHIO.

Whether it be taken in its original sense or in its actual state, as committed against Divinity or humanity, in its more refined forms of hypocrisy, treachery and rascality; or in its boldest acts of infamy, corruption and violence, sin is not an hallucination, a mental deception, or an imagination; but a stern reality, lawlessness, iniquity, the transgression of the great moral law. That all men are sinners is not a popular doctrine. The term native depravity grates harshly on the refined human ear. That all souls, begotten after the common course of humanity, are born in sin is so humiliating to proud human nature. The clear Scriptural statements: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity;" "That which is born of the flesh is flesh;" "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth;" have become very unfashionable, and hence pulpit, press and platform, have denounced them as unworthy of a progressive age and an enlightened century. While men may frequently smother the voice of conscience and stifle their better convictions, they cannot silence the verdict of Scripture: Eccl. 7, 20.

There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not. The more closely man and the great moral standards are compared, the sharper will be the coutrast, the deeper the sense of sin, and the stronger the overwhelming consciousnss of ruin and corruption. Avarice, blasphemy, unholiness, disobedience, hatred, impurity, dishonesty, falsehood and covetousness will rise up before him in hideous forms, haunting his soul, until trembling with fear and quaking with agony, he confesses in the language of Paul: "There is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." If sin is so real and so universal, if the wrath of God is so earnest and so terrible, future punishment, as a final consequence of sin must be a reality. That future punishment is of endless duration, and future conditions final, we know from Scriptural evidences.

1. There will be a resurrection unto life and unto death. Dan. 12, 2. Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to everlasting schame and contempt. *Olam* is the Hebrew word used to modify both the life and the contempt, and this word, when used to modify future life and future punishment, denotes finality of condition. It is an everlasting life and an everlasting contempt. The two stand or fall together. If the contempt, or punishment isn't everlasting, the life, or bliss, isn't everlasting, and annihilation is the only consequence. If the life is everlasting, the contempt must be everlasting also, for the same word is used to modify both the life and the contempt. The question is asked, Can a finite being, committing a finite offense, merit an infinite or everlasting shame and contempt? Certainly. A finite being, committing a finite offense, rejects an infinite sacrifice, the sacrifice of the beloved Son of God, and in so doing offends an Infinite Being — God Himself — and merits, or deserves an infinite or an everlasting shame and contempt. A parallel passage to this one is found in John 5, 28-29. The hour is coming, in which all that are in their graves, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth;

they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation. The question is, What kind of life does John mean? Evidently eternal life, because that is the kind of life promised beyond the grave; and if he means eternal life, then what kind of damnation must he mean? Evidently eternal damnation, because the resurrection unto damnation is placed in juxtaposition with the resurrection unto life. This is also the teaching of passages like: "Shall be cast into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." As long as the faintest star of hope hangs in the sky men do not thus give up all effort and surrender themselves to the merciless devourings of remorse, or shame. It is only when that outer darkness becomes so thick and impenetrable, as to imprison behind its bars of blackness the soul forever and ever, that the shuddering sense of despair creeps over them, and they give vent to their incurable anguish by wailing and gnashing of teeth.

2. The judgment will be final. Hebrews 9, 27. It is given unto men once to die, but after this the judgment. The Greek word used is *κρίσις*, and *κρίσις* denotes judgment, or separation, and when used with *αἰών*, or *ἀιώνιος*, as in Heb. 6, 2, where the expression *κρίματος αἰωνίου*, occurs, it can mean nothing but a final or an eternal separation. The New Testament words for condemnation and judgment and damnation are: *κρίμα*, *κρίσις* and *κατακρίσις*, and whenever these words are used with *αἰών*, *αἰώνιος* or any of their equivalents, they can have but one meaning, that of an eternal condemnation or separation. The final judgment is a solemn act, by which the Triune God, through His Son, appearing in visible form, and in a state of highest glory, will summon all angels and men before His judgment seat, for the purpose of judging all thoughts, words and deeds of the godly, conferring upon them eternal bliss; and of the ungodly, conferring upon them eternal damnation. The judgment, once past, God holds out no hope beyond. Man here chooses one of two conditions, each of which will be final. At the great separation, every indi-

vidual life will be attracted and governed by that element to which it granted admission unto itself. He who admitted the Spirit and light of Christ, will be drawn by Him into the Kingdom of Heaven. He who permitted the spirit of darkness to rule in his heart, will be forced by that spirit into the kingdom of hell. With the final judgment, the painful and incongruous commixture of good and evil, light and darkness, life and death will come to an end forever. The scepter of Jehovah will attain to complete ascendency over all evil. He will reign without let or hindrance, the saints and angels glorifying Him with pure, loving and exultant worship, and the devils, demons and spirits of hell, glorifying that inflexible justice, that absolute sovereignty, which now so terribly prove, what once they scoffed at — that God is not mocked and that whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. When Love has done its utmost, when all kind means prove unavailing, when not the slightest spark of good remains to be enkindled into a regenerating flame, then Justice steps upon the scene, and now let men and angels veil their faces from the awful issue, for to just as infinite depths as Love has gone will the awfully destroying sword of Justice now pierce. Gal. 6, 8. "For he that soweth unto the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth unto the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

3. The sentence will be everlasting. Matt. 25, 46. These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal. The Greek word used is *αἰώνιος*, and *αἰώνιος* when used to modify future life and future punishment, denotes eternal duration. It is an aionion life and an aionion punishment. If the punishment isn't endless, the life isn't endless, but if the life is endless, the punishment must be endless, for the same word, *αἰώνιος*. is used to modify both the life and the punishment. The original word for punishment is *κόλασις*, and *κόλασις*, while it may mean pruning or chastisement, has in it also the sense of painful disquietude and awful torment, and when connected with *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος* it can have but one mean-

ing, that of endless punishment. Endless punishment is that most unhappy state, in which from the just judgment of God, the ungodly, being separated from the glorious light of heaven and associated with devils in the infernal regions, will be tormented most terribly in soul, immediately after its separation from the body, and in both parts of their composite being, when sentence has been passed at the final judgment to the praise of divine truth, and to the glory and exultation of the godly. Is this doctrine in harmony with the divine attributes of God? Certainly divine Justice is no less infinite than divine Love. The same apostle, who calls our heavenly Father a God of love, declares Him to be a consuming fire. "Our God is a consuming fire;" "Vengance is mine;" "It is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Rationalists and other heretic organizations, denying the infinite wrath of God, degrade His love into a reckless infinitude of mercy, that knows no exhaustion forever, and they do this chiefly by dwelling upon divine Goodness as it appears on the face of creation. Such benevolence is, indeed, everywhere present; but never alone, for the existence of infinite wrath is as certainly taught by a thousand spiritual utterances, as the existence of infinite mercy. We may dwell with thanksgiving on the unfolding of the flowers in the spring-time, the sleep of green fields in the sunshine and the whispering of gentle breezes in the branches and leaves of blooming forests; but the barren rock, the bleak moaning winds, the black perilous whirlpools, the fading of all beauty into darkness and the crumbling of all strength into dust; have these no lessons for us? We may try to escape their teaching by dwelling upon the good to be wrought out of all evil; but it is vain sophistry, for light and darkness, life and death, heaven and hell divide man and his future destiny.

4. The punishment will be inflicted by an unquenchable fire. The Hebrew expression in Isa. 66, 24 וְדֵאָתָם לֹא תִכְבֶּה and their fire shall not be quenched, . . . harmonizes with the Greek in Mark 9, 44 . . . εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον . into the fire unquenchable, . . . in proclaiming the doc-

trine of an eternal punishment, and hence the finality of condition in the future world. The expression εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον in Matt. 25, 41, meaning, into the fire everlasting; and the one in Rev. 20, 10 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, meaning, throughout ages of ages, and having reference to the turning of the wicked in the lake of fire and brimstone, surely prove that for those once in hell there is no salvation. Therefore the glaring fires of hell are eternal. It is sometimes said, by those who deny the finality of condition in the future world, that this is an age-lasting fire, the purpose of which is not so much punishment, as it is to play the part of a refiner's fire, purging out the dross and leaving the gold. In the first place, an eternal fire cannot be an age-lasting fire, and in the second place, an unquenchable fire cannot be a purgatorial fire, the purpose of which is to purge out the dross and leave the gold, for the very word, unquenchable, proves that its purpose must be the administration of an endless torment. Thus it was with the rich man, when in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. He didn't regard his torment, as of a medicinal or purgatorial kind; but as a punishment that would continue day and night and forever. He asked for a very short alleviation of the awful torture; but not even the tip of a finger dipped in water was granted him for the cooling of his tongue. Father Abraham didn't tell him that his punishment would be for a limited period of time, that after having suffered for so long, to atone for his sins, he would be released from torture, and be permitted to enter the realm of immortal glory; but he simply told him that the barriers between the raptures of heaven and the torments of hell are fixed forever and ever εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων when he said, "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from us to you cannot, neither can they come from thence to us." The only conclusion is that for those once in hell there is no redemption. What are the means of grace to be enjoyed in hell? How shall the grace

of God dwell with blasphemers and reprobates? Where in all the Bible are we told that souls, once lost, shall be transformed to make them fit for heaven? The very expectation and the faintest hope of those once in hell shall vanish away. The wicked man dieth, and his expectation shall perish, for the hope of unjust men perisheth. Prov. 11, 7. How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? Jer. 8, 20. The day is at hand, let him that is righteous be righteous still; let him that is holy be holy still; let him that is filthy be filthy still; let him that is unjust be unjust still. Rev. 20, 10-11. The conclusion is, the finality of condition in the future world.

5. The punishment in hell is called endless. The Hebrew expression in Isa. 66, 24, לֹא תָמוּת meaning shall not end, or shall not die, harmonizes very beautifully with the Greek terms in Mark 9, 48, *ὁυ τελευτᾶ* meaning, not to end, or not to die. These are evidences proving the existence of a second death beyond the grave, the death that shall never die, the torment that continues forever, the destruction, that does not anihilate the wicked, but that tortures them throughout the eternal ages. It is the *ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον*, eternal destruction, described in 2 Thess. 1, 9. The wicked shall continually suffer the pain of destruction, and yet they shall never be destroyed; hence their condition is final. It is said that to condemn man eternally on account of temporal sins, is contrary to the divine justice of God, because a temporal sin does not merit an endless torment. It is not the time it takes to commit an offense, but the consequence of sin or crime that regulates resultant punishments. Punishment in this life is not always in proportion to crime as to time. How often are the blackest crimes committed in an instant with the consequence of life imprisonment. The crimes and sins of wicked people continued until death closes the door of probation, are offences against the eternal majesty of God of such enormity, that the infinite justice of God demanded an infinite sacrifice — Christ — and they who further offend Him by rejecting and scornfully mocking this infinite sacrifice, during the established time for

repentance, if they merit anything, surely deserve to suffer the death that never dies, the destruction that never ceases, the torment that continues day and night, and εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων throughout ages of ages, a punishment that is without end. If men do not choose conversion now in every case, or even in the majority of cases, how do we know that no exception will be found hereafter? If punishment begets conversion why do not the angels of hell effect a reformation and turn from their evil ways? It is because they have kept not their first estate, because they have left their own habitation, and are now reserved in everlasting chains unto the judgment of the great day. A remarkable lesson of this kind is taught in Rev. 16, 9, where the fourth angel pours out his vial upon the sun and searches men with fire, and thereupon they blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over the plagues, and they repented not to give Him glory. The entire book of Rev. is but a strong delineation of this same truth — the finality of condition in the future world — and the consequent impossibility of conversion, or repentance in the life to come. Its opening of the dread books of destiny, whose tremendous records can neither be purchased nor refuted; its sounding of the trumpets of judgment, awakening the dead from land and sea; its description of the terrible Judge of all nations, before whom heaven and earth affrighted flee away; its pouring out of the vials of wrath upon wicked blasphemous beings of earth and hell; all announce that the final catastrophe has come. And when finally the mighty angel of judgment shall say "It is done" and the wrath of almighty God, who is a consuming fire, shall have swept the wicked into eternal flames, and when the issue of the great struggle, raging all these weary centuries, is decided by the Great Rider upon the White Horse of Destiny, who sweeps all in ruinous consternation before his sharp sword and rod of iron, treading the wine press and fierceness of Almighty God, — do not these awful scenes forebode finality, and forbid as blasphemous and profane the theory that the settled issue is to be re-opened and the awful conflict fought

over and over again? Ah no! the saints and angels are standing on a sea of glass radiant with heavenly fires, singing the praises of Him who is holy and eternal and glorious; the demons and spirits of hell are dwelling amid its lurid flames, and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever, εἰς αἰῶνας αἰώνων, unto ages of ages.

In conclusion we wish to analyze a number of sophistries that have been invented to make it appear that the finality of condition in the future world, as far as the wicked are concerned, is not in harmony with the attributes of God. The first one, The apostle declares that God is love. Hence, when we say that God is omniscient, we but say that love is omniscient; when we say that God is omnipotent, we but say that love is omnipotent; when we say that God is omnipresent, we but say that love is omnipresent; therefore it is impossible for men to get out of this love, and all humanity will be saved. By using the declaration of Paul Heb. 12, 29, Our God is a consuming fire, in the same way, we can prove that all humanity will be damned. "Our God is a consuming fire." When we say that God is omniscient, we but say that a consuming fire is omniscient; when we say that God is omnipotent, we but say that a consuming fire is omnipotent; when we say that God is omnipresent, we but say that a consuming fire is omnipresent. Therefore it is impossible for men to get out of this consuming fire, and all humanity will be damned. Here is a second one. God is infinite in goodness, wisdom and power. 1. His goodness would move Him to save all mankind; 2. His wisdom would enable Him to plan the salvation of all men; 3. His infinite power would give Him ability to execute the plan of His infinite wisdom: therefore all humanity will be saved. By changing the attribute, infinite goodness, to, infinite justice, we can prove that all humanity will be condemned. God is infinite in justice, wisdom and power. 1. His infinite justice would move Him to condemn all mankind; 2. His infinite wisdom would enable Him to plan the condemnation of all men; 3. His infinite power would give Him ability to execute the plan of His

infinite wisdom; therefore all humanity will be condemned. And this is a third one — God is infinite in mercy and power. "His mercy endureth forever." "With God nothing is impossible." 1. He will or will not save the whole human race; 2. He can or cannot save the whole human race; 3. He can and will save the whole human race. If you accept the first, you admit His mercy, but limit His power; if you accept the second, you admit His power, but limit His mercy; if you accept the third you admit universal salvation. By changing the attribute from mercy to wrath, we can prove that all humanity will be damned. "God is infinite in wrath and power." "Flee from the wrath to come." "With God nothing is impossible." 1. He will or will not condemn the whole human race; 2. He can or cannot condemn the whole human race. 3. He can and will condemn the whole human race. If you accept the first, you admit His wrath, but limit His power; if you accept the second, you admit His power, but limit His wrath. If you accept the third you admit universal condemnation. The latter process of reasoning is just as logical and Scriptural as the former. Both are sophistical and unscriptural. It is an utter impossibility to take just one attribute of God, such as His mercy, or His wrath, and prove the absolute salvation or condemnation of the whole human race. The one process is as unscriptural and ridiculous as the other. Both love and justice must be considered in the relation to the human race, and then the blessed result will be: Saved from wrath by mercy in the person of God's beloved Son, who says "Look unto me, and be ye saved all the ends of the earth."

THE GODS OF THE VEDAS.

BY REV. ERNEST SCHULTZ, KANSAS CITY, MO.

"All men yearn after the gods." Homer.

"The world through its wisdom knew not God." Paul.

It is difficult to treat of the so-called gods celebrated in the Vedas according to any system, for the simple reason

that the concepts of these Gods and the Hymns addressed to them sprang up spontaneously and without any pre-established plan. Many functions are shared in common by various gods, no attempt having been made, at organizing the whole body of the gods, sharply separating one from the other, and subordinating all of them to several, or in the end to one sumpreme head.

However we find a striking passage in one of the Hymns of the Rug Veda X; 129, 2, which is appealed to by modern Hindoo reformers as their sole authority for their belief in monism, and it runs to this effect: *"That which is the One."* The poets call in many ways, they call it "Agni Yama, Mâtarisvanon." Some of the sublimest hymns of the Rug Veda are those in which the Rushis give expression to their feeling after this one Supreme Being, if haply he might be found in the sky, or air, in fire or rain. The expression *"Tad Ekam"* (that one neuter) is applied to this being. It is this conception of *Tad Ekam* the one who is formless and qualitiless that becomes developed into the conception of the Brahman, which is the leading term in Hindoo philosophy. Two celebrated passages have often been quoted from the Rug Veda as indicating a belief in Monotheism. One is the famous hymn to the unknown God (R. V. XI: 21) which reads as follows:

In the beginning there arose the germ of Golden Light,
Hiranyagarbha; he was the one born lord of all that is.
He established the earth and the sky —
Who is the god to whom we should offer our sacrifice?

He who gives life, he who gives strength;
Whose command all the bright gods revere;
Whose shadow is immortality and mortality (god and men) —
Who is the god to whom we should offer our sacrifice?

He who through his power became
The sole king of this breathing, slumbering world —
He who governs all, man and beast —
Who is the god to whom we should offer our sacrifice?

He through whose greatness these snowy mountains are,
And the sea, they say, the Rasa with the distant river,
He whose two arms these regions are —
Who is the god to whom we should offer our sacrifice?

He through whom the sky is strong, and the earth firm,
He through whom the heaven was established, nay the highest heaven,
He who measured the light in the air —
Who is the god to whom we should offer our sacrifice?

He to whom heaven and earth, standing firm by his help,
Look up trembling in their minds,
He over whom the rising sun shines forth —
Who is the god to whom we should offer our sacrifice?

When the great waters went everywhere,
Holding the germ and generating fire,
Thence he arose who is the sole life of the bright gods —
Who is the god to whom we should offer our sacrifice?

He who by his might looked even over the waters,
Which gave strength and produced the sacrifice,
He who alone is good above all gods —
Who is the god to whom we should offer our sacrifice?

May he not destroy us, the creator of the earth,
Or he, the righteous, who created the heaven,
He who also created the bright and mighty waters —
Who is the god to whom we should offer our sacrifice?

The monotheistic yearning is no doubt strong in this celebrated hymn and the tenth verse of this hymn refers even to a personal god Prayapati, as the Lord of all created things and it runs as follows: —

"O Prayapati no other but thou
Hast held together all these things;
Whatever we desire in sacrificing to thee
May we receive it, may we be Lords of wealth."

Here is affirmed in language which is most sublime a self-existent substance, the first term in existence, the starting point in the evolution of things, but notwithstanding the bold speculative character of this hymn and

its indication of advanced philosophic thought, we cannot for a moment admit that it enunciates the belief in anything beyond a vague first principle, impersonal in character, which out of a process of self-development gave rise to everything in the universe — a doctrine which is the very basis of pantheism. We do not deny a monotheistic leaning in some of the hymns, but it is nothing more than the vague monotheism which must be at the basis of every form of Polytheism arising out of a vague sense of a want of unity which is attempted to be relieved by an artificial fusion of all the gods, or by identifying one god with several others, or by positing one supreme God above everything else. Does it appear now from above citations, as if in pre-Vedic times a pure monotheistic worship prevailed among the Aryans, which like a fiery ball of a roman candle in the midnight darkness attracted the attention and worship of the teeming millions of the earth, then we see how under the influence of the gorgeous scenery and diversified climate of India, so conducive to dreamy speculations and philosophic abnormities, this unit of light burst into numberless sparks of light; out of the one Deity human reason, darkened and perverted, gradually evolves a pantheon of numberless gods and goddesses, the Devas and Devadasis, Asvins and Adityas, the Maruts and Pitris.

§ 1. THE NUMBER OF THE GODS.

Let us now look at the number of the gods as given in the Vedas. In some hymns the number is given as "thrice eleven." "Ye gods, who are eleven in heaven, who are eleven on earth and who are eleven dwelling with glory in midair, may ye be pleased with this our sacrifice."[1] Agni is invoked to bring the "three and thirty gods with their wives."[2] The Asvins are associated with all the thrice eleven gods, with the Waters, the Maruts, the Bhrigus and

[1] R. V. I: 139, 11.
[2] R. V. I:45, 2; III:6, 9.

united with the Dawn and the Sun, drink Soma."[3] And all these gods thrice eleven in number are in the secret of Soma."[4]

In another hymn "three hundred, three thousand, thirty and nine gods are said to have worshipped Agni."[5]

In the Atharva Veda the Gandharvas, or Demigods alone amount to 6,333.[6]

However the number of Vedic gods, though large, sinks into insignificance when compared with the total number of Hindoo gods, which the traditions of the present age give, viz, three hundred and thirty-three millions!

§ 2. THE NATURE OF THE GODS.

The gods are spoken of in the R. V. as "the former and the latter," "the old and the young." The former are the gods of poetry and the latter the gods of philosophy. The chief characteristics of the former are concrete or physical, and of the latter abstract and metaphysical. We shall consider them under these designations.

1. *Physical Gods.*

All the gods in this class appeal more or less to the senses and hence are called "semitangible" by Max Mueller in his Hibbert lectures.

There are clear traces in some of the hymns of the R. V. that at one time Dyaus, the sky, was the Supreme Deity. He was worshipped by the whole Aryan race, before a word of Sanscrit was spoken in India or Greek in Greece. Max Mueller says: "If I were asked what I consider the most important discovery which has been made during the nineteenth century with respect to the ancient history of mankind, I should answer by the following short line:

"Sanscrit Dyaush — Pitar = *Ζεύς Πατήρ.*

Latin Jupiter = Old Norse Tyr."

---

[3] R. V. VIII:35, 3.
[4] R. V. IX:92, 4.
[5] R. V. III:9, 9.
[6] Atharva Veda XI:5, 2.

Think what this equation implies! It implies that not only our own ancestors and the ancestors of Homer and Cicero, spoke the same language as the people of India — this is a discovery which, however incredible it sounded at first, has long ceased to cause any surprise — but it implies and proves, that they all had once the same faith, and worshipped for a time the same Deity under exactly the same name — a name which meant Heaven — Father."

"Those simple hearted forefathers of ours," says C. Kingsley, "looked round upon the earth and said within themselves, "where is the Allfather, if Allfather there be? Not in this earth, for it will perish. Nor in the sun, moon or stars; for they will perish too. Where is he who abideth forever?'

"They they lifted up their eyes, and saw, as they thought, beyond sun, and moon, and stars, and all which changes and will change the clear blue sky, the boundless firmament of heaven. That never changed; that always was the same. The clouds and storm rolled far below it, and all the bustle of this noisy world; there the sky was still, as bright and calm as ever. The Allfather must be there, unchangeable in the unchanging heaven; bright and pure, and boundless like the heavens; and like the heavens, too, silent and far off." "And how," says Max Müller, "did they call that Allfather? Five thousand years ago, or, it may be earlier, the Aryans speaking as yet neither Sanscrit, Greek nor Latin, called him Dyupatar, Heaven-Father."

"Four thousand years ago, or, it may be earlier, the Aryans who had travelled southward to the rivers of the Punjab called him Dyaush-pita, Heaven-Father."

"Three thousand years ago, or, it may be earlier, the Aryans on the shores of the Hellespont called him *Ζεὺς πατήρ*. Heaven-Father."

"Two thousand years ago, the Aryans of Italy looked up to that bright heaven above, and called it Jupiter, Heaven- Father."

"And a thousand years ago the same Heaven-Father and All-Father was invoked in the dark forests of Germany by the Teutonic Aryans, and his old name of Ziu or Tio or Thor, was then heard perhaps for the last time."

"If we want a name for the invisible, the infinite, that surrounds us on every side, the unknown, the true self of the world, and the true self of ourselves — we, too, feeling once more like children kneeling in a small dark room, can hardly find a better name than that give us by Christ: *πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*[7] "Our Father who art in Heaven;" and *τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φωτῶν*,[8] The Father of lights.

Closely associated with Dyaush Pitar, yea invoked promiscousuoly is Varuna, the *Οὐρανός* of the Greeks and the Ahura Madza of the Persians. It is another name for the sky, from *var* to cover, meaning the firmament or the encircling canopy of heaven. The Vedas describe Varuna in the most exalted language. The sun is his eye, the heaven his garment and the resounding wind his breath. In the Atharva Veda illimitable knowledge is ascribed to him: "Varuna, the great Lord of these worlds sees as if he were near. If a man stands or walks or hides, if he goes to lie down or to get up, what two people sitting together whisper to each other, King Varuna knows it: he is there as the third. This earth, too, belongs to Varuna, the King, and the wide sky with the ends far apart. The two seas, the sky and the ocean, are Varuna's loins. He is also contained in this small drop of water. He who would flee far beyond the sky, even he would not be rid of Varuna the King."[9]

Varuna is about the only Divinity in the Hindoo pantheon to whom a high moral character is attributed. While in hymns to the other divinities long life, wealth, power, large families and numerous cattle are the objects commonly prayed for, of Varuna is craved purity, forgive-

---

[7] Matt. 6, 9.
[8] James 1, 17.
[9] A. V. IX:16.

ness of sin, freedom from its further commission. To him is offered humble confessions of guilt and repentance. It is a sore grief to the poets to know that man daily transgresses Varuna's commandments; they acknowledge that without his aid they are not masters of a single moment; they fly to him for refuge from evil, expressing at the same time all confidence that their prayers will be heard and granted.

In the Puranas, Varuna is stripped of all his majestic attributes and presented as a mere god of the ocean.

Were Dyans and Varuna the principal deities of the ancient Aryan in their original home, representing the bright blue sky or the starry heaven and looked upon as benevolent deities, the Aryans having invaded India with an altogether different climate, where the sun with his fierce heat, and the blinding clearness of the sky, became dreadful to them, the benevolent aspect of Dyans and Varuna gave place to an aspect of terror and their influence waned and they were replaced by a god in whose hands are thunder and lightning and at whose command refreshing showers fall to render the earth fruitful. *Indra* now became the popular Deity. In Sanscrit the drops of rain are called *ind-u,* and he who sends them *Ind-ra,* the rainer, the irrigator. In the burning nine months of the hot season, when the earth becomes parched and not a drop of rain falls, the ancient Aryan turned to Indra. Vritra (Drought), his enemy, witholds the refreshing showers for which all eyes long. So when at last along the western horizon the vapors thicken, and longed-for storm breaks in grandeur — when they see the blinding dust whirling in lofty columns on its mighty march, and the swift sand flies low along the ground — when they see the blue flashes which pierce the clouds, and hear the crashing peals of the awful thunder, it is Indra and his Maruts who are fighting the celestial battle on their behalf. And when the driving rain pours from the heavy clouds, and the earth drinks it in, all nature renews its life, fresh verdure clothes the fields, and the birds carol their joyous songs, when the

immense herds of sacred cows give expression to their delight over the fresh pastures, by lowing which resembles the distant thunder, then it is to the mighty Indra that the sacrifices of praise are paid, and the clarified butter burns on the sacrificial altar. Sometimes the clouds are represented under the figure of herds of cows, stolen by the demons and hidden in the caverns of the mountains. Indra finds them, splits the caverns with his bolts and they come out and their teats shower down the rain.

Indra is exalted above Dyans, "The divine Dyans bowed before Indra, before Indra the great Earth bowed with her wide spaces. Indra drives a golden chariot drawn by two yellow horses; the thunderbolt is his weapon, the rainbow is his bow; the Maruts or stormgods are his companions. Like other Hindoo gods he is provided with a wife called Indrani. Indra's special characteristics are his fondness for war, Soma drinking and adultery. Some of his feats are thus described in the Rug Veda I:53:

"6. These draughts inspired thee, O Lord of the brave
These were vigor, these libations in battles,
When for the sake of the poet the sacrificer,
Thou struckest down irresistibly ten thousands of enemies.

7. From battle to battle thou advancest bravely,
From town to town thou destroyest all this with might,
When thou, Indra, with Nami as thy friend,
Struckest down from afar the deceiver Namuchi."

Many instances are recorded of his adultery. According to the Mahabharata, he seduced Ahalya, the wife of Gautama, his spiritual teacher. By the curse of the sage, Indra's body was impressed by a thousand marks, so that he was called Sa-yoni; but these marks were afterward changed to eyes, and he is hence called "the thousand-eyed." Another of the most prominent deities of the Rug Veda is *Agni,* the god of fire, the Latin word *ignis.* Far more hymns are addressed to him than to any other deity except Indra. In early times when matches, gas and electricity were unknown, when fire was produced by the friction of

wood or suddenly appeared from heaven in the lightning, it was something marvelous and looked upon with religious awe. In the hymns of the Vedas fire is praised and worshipped as the best and kindest of Gods, the only god who had come down from heaven to live on earth, the friend of man, the messenger of the gods, mediator between the gods and men, the immortal among mortals. He, it is said, protects the settlements of the Aryans, and frightens away the "black skinned enemies."

He is occasionally identified with other gods and goddesses, Ushas the dawn, and Lurya the sun, with Indra, Varuna, Vishnu, Rudra, Sarasvati, etc. "All gods," it is said, "are comprehended in him."

Agni was worshipped by the fire kindled in the morning. The whole family gathered around it, regarding it with love and awe, as at once a friend and a priest. It was a visible god conveying the oblation of mortals to all gods. At sunset Agni is the only divinity left on earth to protect mortals till the following dawn; his beams then shine abroad and dispel the demons of darkness.

Agni's proper offering is ghee, or clarified butter. When this is sprinkled into the flame it mounts higher and glows more fiercely; several of his epithets describe his fondness for butter. He is butter-fed, butter-formed, butter-haired, butter-baked, etc. As destroyer of the Raikshasas, Agni assumes a different character. He is presented in a form as hideous as the beings he is invoked to devour. He sharpens his two iron tusks, puts his enemies into his mouth, and swallows them. He heats the edges of his shaft and sends them into the hearts of the Raikshasas.

The first hymn of the Rug Veda is addressed to Agni, and all the other books, except two, begin with hymns to him. *Surya,* the sun-god, notwithstanding his frequent identification with Agni, was worshipped as a separate deity, under different names corresponding to its various functions or appearances, such as Savitri, livener; Pushan, nourisher; Mitra, friend; Ushas, the dawn; Vishnu, the sun as striding with three steps across the sky. Ushas in

in one place is said to be his daughter and wife both, while in another she is described as his mother.

At his rising he is called Savitri, and Surya from his rising to his setting. Savitri is pre-eminently the golden deity, being golden-eyed, golden-handed, golden-tongued. He is the Lord of all desirable things and sends blessings from on high, the atmosphere and the earth. He rides in a golden chariot, drawn by brown, white-footed horses.

The worship of Savitri has continued until this day. It is to him that the Gayatri addressed at his rising by every devout Brahman. This short verse is supposed to exert magical powers. It as follows:

> Tat Savitur varengyam bhargo devasya dhimohi. |
> dhiyo yo nah prachodayat | III. 62. 10
> "May we attain that excellent glory of Savitar the god:
> So may he stimulate our prayers."

The Skanda Purnana thus extols this verse:

"Nothing in the Vedas is superior to the Gayafri. No invocation is equal to the Gayatri, as no city is equal to Kasi. The Gayatri is the mother of the Vedas and Brahmanas. By repeating it a man is saved. What is there indeed that cannot be effected by the Gayatri? For the Gayatri is Vishnu, Brumha, Shiva and the three Vedas." Herewith we will conclude the chapter on the physical gods although we might continue ad infinitum, since everything that excited the sentiments of pain or pleasure, joy or sadness, confidence or apprehension, found a niche in the Vedic Pantheon. The mountains, rivers, trees and plants are invoked as so many high powers. The animals which surround man, the horse under the soldier, the cow that supplies nourishment, the dog that protects the dwelling, the frogs croaking in the pool, the bird which by its cry reveals the future, receive worship and adoration. The Pitris spirits of ancestors; Yama the god of Hell, and his two terrific dogs which guard the entrance to immortality; the sacrificial victims and utensils, bows, arrows, axes, and drums, etc., are all invoked.

2. *Metaphysical Gods.*

As the preceding class contains the "former" gods, the gods of Poetry, so this class contains the "latter" the gods of Philosophy. Unlike the former, these do not appeal to the senses; there is nothing in nature corresponding to them; they are the pure creation of the human mind, the result of abstraction of generalization.

"The human mind is swayed by two imperious tendencies, the one impels it to connect effects with their causes; the other, to carry up its knowledge into unity. Both tendencies, if not identical in their origin, coincide in their result; for in proportion as we ascend from cause to cause, the nearer we approach the absolute unity."

In obedience to this imperious tendency of the mind to generalize its knowledge, the Vedic Aryans began at a very early period to abstract and classify the gods. They divided them into three classes of equal numbers, and assigned to them three separate localities as their abode.[10]

They then joined together the names of two gods, sharing certain functions in common and formed a compound with a dual termination, which compound they invoked as a new deity, Dyāvaprithivi, Mitravarunau, and Indravayu. They also grouped the gods together under a common name, Visvadevas, the allgods, and addressed prayers and praises to them in their collective capacity. Advancing a step further in their generalization, they perceived that many gods, having sprung from the same source, had a great many attributes and functions in common. They suspected, therefore, that their essence, or what underlies them, is one and the same, though variously named. "They call him (the sun) Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Agni; then he is the well-winged heavenly Gamtmāt; that which is one, the wise call it many ways; they call it Agni, Yama, Mātarisvan."[11]

---

[10] R. V., I, 139-II. A. V., X, 9, 72.
[11] R. V., I., 164, 46.

At last an old sage flashed forth a few thoughts—whether as a reminiscence or as the guess of genius—which by reflection ought to have led to the recognition of our Supreme Being, separate from nature. Musing on the beginning of all things, he goes back to the nothing which preceded the works of creation and says, "There was then neither nonentity (*asad*) nor entity (*sad*); there was no atmosphere nor sky above. Death was not there, nor immortality; there was no distinction of day or night. 'That One' (*Tad Ekam*) breathed calmly, self-supported; there was nothing different from or above It. Desire first rose in It, which was the primal germ of mind, and which sages, searching with their intellect, have discerned in their heart to be the bond which connects entity with nonentity."[12]

Here the existence of one self-existent being is boldly asserted. He existed before creation. He existed, not as a great principle or an omnipresent power, but as a satient Being, having a "desire" or "will;" by which "desire" or "will" "entity" was produced from "nonentity," the world from the unfathonable abyss.

"This is the nearest approach to monotheism in the whole Vedas. It seems strange from the position of those who try to account for the conception of god on natural grounds alone, that, possessing such ideas, and knowing the attributes of the Infinite, the old Bards did not go a step further and grasp the idea of God in all its fulness. But it was not to be. As soon as the Hindoo abstracts the idea of god from natural phenomena he loses sight of nature altogether and merges all in God. Thus the two streams of Polytheism and Pantheism, through ages, run parallel in India to this day. Polytheism is the religion of Kshatriya, Sudra and Pariah and Pantheism is the religion of the Brahman and a few thoughtful of the other classes. "Here we meet again with the idea of 'That' *Om,* but without the embodied 'One' of the hymn, as an expression

[12] R. V., X, 129, 1, 2, 4.

of the highest abstraction of Philosophy, viz: Monism, or the unity of thought. Before reaching that, however, the Hindoo mind had to travel through the intricate labyrinth of two conceptions, different in their origin, which, after running parallel for a time, became united under the appellation 'That.' The two conceptions are (1) Atman, and (2) Brumha.

"1. Atman from *ah,* to breathe, means life, soul, spirit, self or *ego,* both individual and universal. 'Increase, O bright Indra,' this our manifold food, by which, O Hero, thou givest us life (Tman) like sap,[13] to move everywhere. "Here *Tman,* another form of *Atman,* means life, particularly animal life. In a hymn addressed to a horse, which is about to be sacrificed, it is said, 'Let not thy dear self (*priya atma*) burn or afflict thee as thou approachest the sacrifice.' Here *priya atma* is used as the reflexive pronoun, 'thyself' denoting personality.[15] Perceiving that the true principle of life is not the body or the outward form, but the breath or the spirit within, the ancient Aryans concluded that the world, also, is the body, or the outward form of a breath, a soul, or a self within, which is its life. (*Weltseele.*) This soul the *Atman* of the world can only mean that self-exisent, free, independent spirit, which though the Rushis did not grasp it, is the life of all lives and the moving power of all things."

This idea of the Soul, or Self, of the world developed in the Brahmanas and Upanishads until it absorbed all other ideas and existences — until it was regarded as the only real entity.

"In the beginning this (world) was Self alone; there was nothing else winking. He thought, let me create the worlds and he created the worlds."[16] "As the web issues from the spider; as little sparks proceed from fire; so from the one soul proceed all breathing animals, all worlds, all

[13] See this illsutrated in the Khandogya Upanished, V.
[14] R. V., I, 63, 8.
[15] Ibid., I, 162. 20 M. Müller H. S. L., page 20.
[16] Aitareya aryanaka Upanishad, 4; I, 1, 2.

the gods, and all beings."[17] "Being in this world, we may know the Supreme Spirit; if there be ignorance of him then complete death ensues; those who know him become immortal." "As flowing rivers are resolved into the sea, losing their names and forms,[18] so the wise, freed from name and form, pass into the Divine Spirit, which is greater than the great. He who knows that Supreme Spirit becomes Spirit."[19]

2. *Brahma.* "In the Rug Veda, Brahma, from a root signifying force, wish, or will, means prayer or sacred text, because a subtle influence was supposed to accompany the utterances of a sacred formula, sufficiently strong to bend the gods, and make the act of sacrifice effectual. And Brahman in the masculine means, "he of prayer," the man who utters prayers, the priest, and gradually the Brahman by profession.[20]

"Come Indra let us make prayers (*brahmani*) which magnify thee." "A new prayer (*brahma navya*) has been made for thee." "Indra is a priest (*brahma*). "He it is whom they call Rushi, a priest, a pious sacrificer (rishim brahmanam yajanyam)."[21] Brahma, in the sense of a god Atharva, the most recent, he is spoken of as a god "who dwells in the highest place, whose measure is the earth, whose belly is the atmosphere, whose head is the sky, and who is worthy of all reverence.[22] In the Brahmanas he is more fully developed, and is spoken of as the "first born," the "self-existent," the creator of heaven and earth," and the best of the gods."[23]

No wonder that the ancient Hindoos who were so deeply impressed with mysterious powers everywhere, deified the power of prayer, which influencing the gods must be

[17] Brihadaryanaka Up. II, 1, 20; Mundaka Up., 1, 7.
[18] Brihadaryanaka Up. IV, 14, 4 Svetasvatara Up., 5, 9.
[19] Mundaka Up. III, 2, 5, 9.
[20] R. V., 1. 80, 1; II, 2, 5; X, 85, 3; II. 39, 1.
[21] R. V., VIII, 167; X, 107, 6.
[22] A. V., X, 7, 17, 24, 32.
[23] Satapatha Brahmana VIII, 21, 7. 3.

stronger than they, must in fact be "That One" (*Tad Ekam*).

Thus prayer, being defied He, the hearer of prayer, Agni or Brahmanaspati disappeared. His function as the hearer of prayer was transferred to the personified prayer (*brahma*) and his function as a High Priest was transferred to the Brahmans, the utterers of prayer. This is the origin of both the god Brahma which now is the first in the Hindoo Triad (Brahma, Shiva, Vishnu), and the Brahman caste, which has ruled India with a rod of iron for the last twenty-six hundred years or more.

What an awful degradation of religion to substitute the cold, unfeeling, metaphysical god, Brahma, for the bright, humane, sympathetic Agni, the "father, brother, friend of all," and to exchange the haughty, disdainful Brahman who considers himself defiled by contact with any one below himself in the social scale, for a High Priest who, though god, condescended to be the "guest of everyone," smiling on all without distinction.

Max Müller says, "It was an epoch in the history of the human mind when the identity of the masculine Self and the neutral Brahma was for the first time perceived. And the name of the discoverer has not been forgotten. It was Sāndilya who declared that the Self within our hearts is Brahma."[24]

Then after identifying the two ideas — Atman and Brahma — both are resolved into the original "That" of R. V. 129, 2. 3. "All worlds are contained in Brahma and no one goes beyond. This is 'That'." "As the one fire, after his entered the world, through one, becomes different by whatever it burns, thus the one Self within all beings becomes different according to whatever it enters, and exists also without." The wise who perceive him within their Self, to them belongs eternal happiness; not to others." "They perceive that highest, indescribable pleasure, saying this is 'That'."[25]

---

[24] Hist. Auc. Sans. Lit., page 223.

[25] Katha. Up. II, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14; 6, 1.

We may suitably close this section in the words of Dr. Christlieb, "If the thoughts of the old Hindoos did sometimes rise from the contemplation of various deified phenemena to that of one primal cause of all things, this cause was regarded not as the one God, but as an impersonal, undefined existence, of which all that could be said was, *that* is not *what* it is; with which therefore every personal communion in prayer would be impossible."[26]

This quite agrees with the Brihadaryanaka Upanishad, which says that the teaching of Brahma is

"No, No"![27]

A SERMON.

BY REV. S. SCHILLINGER, A. M., WEST ALEXANDRIA, O.

(*Gal.* 4, 21-31.)

Beloved Brethren: — Many and beautiful are the illustrations Scriptures use to impress their truths upon our hearts. The apostle in our text uses an impressive illustration to demonstrate the futile effort of salvation by the deeds of the law, and sets forth the beautiful and comforting doctrine of salvation alone by the free grace of Christ.

However clearly the Bible teaches that no one can obtain the forgiveness of sins, life and salvation by the deeds of the law, yet there are thousands who have fallen into this error, and will not suffer themselves to be enlightened by the gifts of the Holy Ghost. This is true of the Jews, who based the hope of their salvation upon their alms, long prayers and self-righteousness. It is true of the Papists, who hope to be saved by their pilgrimages, penances and good works.

It is so natural for our proud, unenlightened reason to harbor this erroneous view. Reason is not willing to

---

[26] Modern Doubt and Christian Belief.

[27] Bry. Ar., III, 9, 26.

submit to the simple teachings of the Gospel. It wants to elevate itself above the Word. It spurns the thought of considering itself, relative to meriting anything in the sight of God, worthless. It becomes enraged when it learns that it must look entirely away from itself and alone to Jesus to be saved.

There is no doctrine, however, more dangerous than the doctrine of salvation by the deeds of the law. It is so dangerous because it separates man from Christ, his only Savior, and makes him vain and proud. It is not only a very inconsistent doctrine, but very offensive to our gracious Lord, because there is no doctrine more expressive of ingratitude. Let us suppose that a man rescues his neighbor from drowning; but as soon as the neighbor is out of the water he turns to his rescuer, and instead of thanking him heartily for saving his life, he says to him: "You did not help me any. I wish you would have just left me alone. I would rather you had not touched me. I could have helped myself. I was just ready to leap from the surging waves when I felt your hand lay hold of me." What would you think of a man, just ready to sink to rise no more, who would thus talk to his rescuer? Would you not consider his ingratitude indescribable? That is precisely the attitude in which the Jews, Papists and all self-righteous souls stand to their Lord. He has rescued them, but they refuse to acknowledge it, and to be grateful. Yea more, they break away from their Rescuer, leap back into the surging waves, and are forever lost.

This is the awful truth the apostle wants to impress upon the hearts of the Galatians with the two covenants. That we may be warned also, let us by the grace of God consider

THE TWO COVENANTS.

I. *The legal covenant, and*

II. *The gospel covenant.*

There were some among the Galatians who preferred to remain under the law, i. e., under the ten command-

ments; and that not so much that they might please God with a pious and Christian walk, but that they might be saved. Hence the apostle says: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons; the one from a bond-maid, the other from a free woman. But he who was born of the bond-woman was born after the flesh, but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants: the one from mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem, which now is, and is in bondage with her children."

An allegory is a figure of speech which draws from an historical event a deeper meaning than simply history. It is an historical truth that Abraham had two sons, the one from Hagar, his legal wife's hand-maid, or servant, and the other from Sarah, his lawful wife. The apostle now uses this bit of history to illustrate the doings and effects of the law and of the gospel relative to man's future condition.

Hagar is in bondage with her son, and finally cast out. So are all those in bondage who are under the law and if they, to their end, trust their salvation to the deeds of the law, they will eventually be cast out. The son of the bond-woman was born after the flesh, i. e., outside of the lawful marriage relation. It was not God's will that Abraham should have a son with Hagar, his lawful wife's maid-servant. The very first incentive to this illegal issue was the outgrowth of rationalism. It was devised in Sarah's heart. She was the first incentive to Abraham's unlawful relation with Hagar, from which resulted the son of bondage. What incited Sarah to give her hand-maid to her husband, for an issue to be raised in her name, was her mistrust in the promise of God. God had promised them a son, and that in him all nations should be blessed, and in His own good time He fulfilled His promise also. But Abraham and Sarah waited a long time for the promised

son. God left them wait to prove their faith. Yea, they waited until Sarah had passed the age, when humanly speaking, there would be no possibility of an issue. She thought God's hand was too short, that the promise could not be fulfilled in an orderly way, within the limit of the legitimate marriage relation, therefore she said to Abraham, her husband: "Behold now, the Lord hath restrained me from bearing. I pray thee, go in unto my maid; it may be that I may obtain children by her." Although Sarah's intentions were well meant, she did wrong in despairing of God's promise, and resorted to a sinful plan to have her intentions materialize. Her action is the result of relying upon reason, or upon the flesh. But the Lord does not make use of her plan — for although Hagar bore a son according to Sarah's intention, God taught her that He does not need the manipulations of man's reason to aid Him in executing His plans.

Before the son, according to the flesh, was born, however, Sarah began already to reap the bitter fruits of her mistake. As soon as Hagar had conceived she became proud and haughty in the midst of her shame, and despised her mistress. "And Sarah said unto Abraham, My wrong be upon thee: I have given my maid into thy bosom; and when she saw that she had conceived, I was despised in her eyes."

Now this Hagar, who despised her mistress, together with her son, represent the covenant which is called the law. When we follow the history of Hagar and her son the words of our text are verified. She was the Egyptian, an oppressor. The Egyptians knew how to oppress. They were nothing but taskmasters. This spirit was in Hagar notwithstanding that she was a servant, and at the first opportunity she sought to make her domineering spirit to be felt. How true this is also of the law! It only oppresses, domineers and frightens its children. They who are under the law are even in a worse condition than the children of Israel under Egyptian bondage. Israel was only under temporary bondage, but they who are under

the law are under spiritual and eternal bondage. It can only bring its children into bondage, as our text clearly says: "The one," i. e., Hagar and her son "from mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage . . . For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children." This is true because the law makes demands which are impossible for her children to fulfill. It makes requirements but gives no strength to do that which it requires. "For as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse; for it is written: cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Why are they accursed? Because the law is perfect, and demands something perfect from an imperfect creature; for man, the creature, is not perfect; therefore, however much he tries to fulfill the law, he always falls short, and comes under its condemnation. Mount Sinai gendereth to bondage every time. "Therefore by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Again, "Knowing that man is not justified by the works of the law." Let these passages suffice to prove to us that we cannot be saved as long as we would be Hagar's children, children of the Jerusalem which now is and is in bondage with her children. Again we learn that Hagar despised and mocked Sarah. So does the law mock the miseries of its subjects. The more they try to be saved by the deeds of the law, the more it mocks their dejected and oppressed condition, and the more they must feel that they are debtors to the law. This is the experience that every earnest soul must make. It cannot be otherwise, for the more he tries the more he will feel the sceptre of oppression hanging over him, and the more he will realize that he has come short of complying with its demands.

Again, we are told that "the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband." This is true in every age. There are always more who want to be saved by the deeds of the law, and upon their own righteousness

than through faith in Christ. In the days of the Savior there were more scribes, Pharisees and Jews who expected to be saved by their own works, or by their idea of fulfilling the law, than true followers of "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." In the days of the Reformation, and many years before, there were many people who expected to be saved by penances, pilgrimages and all kinds of self-torture than there were followers of the true evangelical doctrine. If the views of people were carefully examined in the light of God's Word, in our age, it would no doubt be learned that there are legions who hope to be saved by their own works. There are more Papists to-day than there are Protestants. All who expect to be saved any other way than through Christ are children of desolation, children of the law, children of her who never had an husband, who never was any more than a hand-maid, the hand-maid of the gospel.

Again the apostle says: "But as then, he that was born of the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now." This passage has been repeatedly verified. It is the truth that Ishmael persecuted Isaac. The children of the world, and of the covenant of the law, have always persecuted the children of God. How was not David persecuted by those who opposed the people of God, and even by Saul and his followers, who wanted to be the servants of God. Even David's own beloved son Absalom stole the hearts of the people away from his father, and inaugurated a bloody war against him. How were not the prophets persecuted and put to death by the children of her who had no husband! When we turn to the days of the Savior we see a host of scribes and Pharisees, Jews ravening mad at the teachings of the Savior. Finally they bribed one of the Savior's disciples cruelly to betray Him into the hands of the children of desolation. They persecuted and put Him to death, the most cruel death upon the cross. Desperate beyond description are the children of the law. What did they afterward with Christ's disciples? In the most cruel manner imaginable

they put them all to death save John. Some were crucified with their heads downward. How have these children of desolation been raging against the children of promise ever since? In the first centuries thousands of Christians were put to death in the most cruel manner. What a fiendish work of putting Christians to death was carried on by the Romish church for several centuries before the Reformation! They seemed determined to keep the truth under and to extirpate the children of promise. If they had the power they would do the same to-day yet. Do not imagine that the power of Rome is to be sneered at or despised. That wicked woman, of whom John writes in Revelations, who sits upon her seven hills and who spilled the blood of thousands of saints is raising her head ever higher and higher in our own beloved land. She never grows weary in her wicked work. This is the way the children of desolation have ever conducted themselves toward the children of promise.

Again, Ishmael was born before Isaac. So was Moses born before Jesus Christ. The law was delivered upon mount Sinai, in the midst of terrific peals of thunder, before the heavenly hosts sang to the shepherds, upon the plains of Judea: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will to men."

But finally, the apostle says: "Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son: for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman." When we turn to the 21st chapter of Genesis we read: "And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking. Wherefore she said unto Abraham: Cast out the bond-woman and her son: for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son. And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of the bond-woman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice. . . . And Abraham rose up early in

the morning, and took bread and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent them away." This will be the lot of the children of the law. All who trust their salvation to the deeds of the law shall not be heirs with the children of promise, but they shall be cast out. That such is the case is not God's fault. It is not an act of unmercifulness on the part of God. It is the people's fault who prefer to be children of bondage. They refuse to obey the call of the gospel, therefore they must suffer the consequences. If Hagar and Ishmael had been obidient, if they had not despised and mocked Sarah and Isaac they would not have been driven from Abraham's home. God's Word plainly teaches that we cannot merit salvation by the deeds of the law, and yet people undertake it, and thus mock the blessed Savior, therefore they must suffer the consequences and be cast out.

Having considered the covenant of the law and its consequences, let us consider that which is of still greater importance, viz.:

II. *The Gospel Covenant.*

In this covenant alone the Christian can find comfort. It is purely the covenant of comfort. It is represented by Sarah and her son Isaac. She was Abraham's wife according to the will of God, and Isaac was the heir according to promise. "But he of the free woman was by promise." These words must be fulfilled.

Sarah was beautiful to look upon. Her very name expresses beauty. She was so beautiful that when Abraham journeyed in the land of Gerar, Abimelech was smitten with her beauty. Had it not been for a special warning of God to the king in a dream, he would have taken her away from Abraham to become his own wife. So is the gospel beautiful. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good; that publisheth salvation: that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth! Thy watchmen shall lift up their voice, with the voice

together shall they sing: for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion. Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem: for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem." Here the pen of the prophet describes the beauties of the gospel covenant more perfectly than lies in the power of man to-day. The Holy Spirit draws this pen picture. Again the apostle says: "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things." What sweet and comforting words! and how they breathe the love and mercy of the gospel covenant! There is no word in all the Bible as sweet as that gospel message of peace.

Sarah had a sweet and gentle disposition. So has the gospel of Jesus Christ. No word calls man so earnestly and invitingly and friendly as the gospel. Jesus the true Son of the living God, God himself, the friend of sinners, says: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." The gospel never frightens. It said to Zacharias, to Mary, to the shepherds, to the Marys at the sepulchre and to the disciples, "fear not." The same comforting words are addressed to us. It never says, "Cast out," but invites everybody to come. Its doctrines are sweet and comforting. "It is a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." The law can no longer terrify us for the gospel has taken away its terrors. It has delivered us from the mocking of the law. When the law says, you are condemned, the gospel says, you are saved if you believe in Jesus Christ. In Abraham's seed, which is Sarah's son, all nations shall be blessed. Christ descended from Isaac, and He is the Seed through whom these great blessings have been spread over all nations. Christ is the center of the gospel covenant. All who believe in Him to their end are the sons of promise. They shall be delivered from among the children of the Jerusalem which now is and is in bondage. They shall be the inhabitants of the new Jerusalem which is above, which has been freed

by the blood of Jesus, and which is the mother of us all. Christ has fulfilled the law for us. Every commandment has been perfectly fulfilled through His active and passive obedience; therefore we are no longer under the burden of the law. He died for us that the guilt of our sins might be taken away, and we might be freed from death and from the power of the devil. Is that not comforting? Who can harm those who are in Christ Jesus? Neither the threatenings of the law, death nor the devil can hurt nor harm the children of promise. Can it be possible that any one could desire yet to be under the law, knowing that the freedom which Christ has purchased with His holy precious blood, is perfect, and is offered to all without money and without price? It is a gift of free grace. Come then and let us leave everything behind and flee to Christ and Him crucified:

"In my hand no price I bring,
Simply to thy cross I cling."

This is the beautiful covenant which Sarah and her son of promise represent. This is the beautiful picture the apostle is drawing before the minds of the Galatians, that they might put away their foolish notions of being saved by the deeds of the law, and cling to Christ and become children of the new Jerusalem which is above, which is the mother of us all. Who can behold this pen picture and not be transported into the Elysian realms? Considering the beautiful gospel covenant which brings us the meek and lowly Jesus, who is always ready to do good to fallen man, must we not lift up our hearts in gratitude to God for His great mercy? We were those fallen creatures, but God took pity on us, and gave us a Savior. He was promised to our first parents in the garden of Eden, when it was said that the seed of the woman should crush the head of the serpent. This promise was renewed to Abraham when he received the assurance that in his seed all nations should be blessed. The son of promise came, and in due

time the Savior of the world appeared. He set the captives of the law free, established the new Jerusalem, and all who believe in Him and persevere in that faith unto the end are citizens of that Jerusalem which is the mother of us all. Amen.

NOTES.

BY G. H. S.

NEW SPANISH CONCORDAT.

While the French have practically discarded the Concordat with the Vatican, the Spanish government has agreed to a new arrangement of this sort with the church authorities, by which, as is claimed by the Munich *Neueste Nachrichten,* "the clericalism of that terribly abused country has been entirely handed over to the monks, and one must ask with amazement how Minister Maura could dare to prevent an agreement of this sort, that is a mockery to all rights of the state, to the Cortez." The Concordat consists of eleven articles, and is exceedingly liberal in the privileges it grants to the religious orders. It is, indeed, declared that those orders that are engaged in manufacturing and mercantile pursuits are subject to the ordinary laws of the state, but that, nevertheless, they are to be managed by their superiors and in accordance with common law, but cannot be subject to supervision or special taxation. The present order houses shall continue to exist, except those having fewer than twelve members; and new houses can be established with royal consent. No order devoted to charitable work can be closed. The school orders retain all their present rights and privileges. Foreigners cannot establish any orders or found order houses without first becoming Spanish citizens. All disputes and differences in this matter are to be adjusted in a friendly way between the Vatican and the Spanish government.

Even Catholic papers agree that this is progressing backward, as far as the power of the Spanish government

over against the monks is concerned, the over-production of which element has ever aroused an "Away from Rome" movement in Spain, that declares, in the words of its leaders: "We are Catholics, but anti-Jesuistic." At present there are about 100,000 order people in Spain, or one to every 185 inhabitants. The *Chronik,* of Leipzig, reports that practically the entire press of Spain is protesting loud and long against this new arrangement, which abases the state before the church and gives the church authorities absolute power over the orders; and methods and manners are suggested to make the new Concordat a dead letter. A regular organization against the Concordat has been made, with such Republicans as Salmeron, Moret and the Marquis Vega de Armigo at its head. The Cortes has not yet accepted the scheme, and it is hoped that the propaganda against it will prevent its adoption.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

NUMBER 1.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 1
The Importance of Elocution for Ministers of the Gospel. By Rev. Walter E. Tressel..... 13
A Sermon. By Rev. S. Schillinger..... 28
The Fundamental Principles of the Theory and Practice of Christian Missions. By Rev. J. E. Kieffer..... 38
The Pastor as a Student and Writer. By Rev. J. G. Troutman 52
The Leading Ideas of Judges. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 58
Notes. By G. H. S..... 61

NUMBER 2.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 65
The Doctrines of the Scriptures Concerning Original Sin. By Rev. A. F. Rohr, A. M..... 76
The Savior's Names as Recorded in Scriptures. By Rev. Julius Boehmer 100
The Christian in Temptation. By Rev. Fred W. Rohlfing.... 114
The Constant Need and the Wide Scope of the Church's Missionary Work. By Rev. M. H. Hockman..... 120
Notes. By G. H. S..... 125

NUMBER 3.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 129
The Science that Rules the Day. By Rev. C. B. Gohdes, A. M. 139
Studies in Vedic Religion. By Rev. Ernest Schultz..... 150
The Doctrines of the Scriptures Concerning Original Sin. By Rev. A. F. Rohr, A. M..... 160
Notes. By G. H. S..... 186

NUMBER 4.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 193
The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. By Rev. M. R. Walter..... 199
Sermon. By Rev. Walter L. Spielman, A. B..... 218

The Pastor's Pastor. By Prof. A. Pflueger, A. M..... 225
The Augsburg Confession. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 232
A Study of Luke 23, 34. By Rev. F. W. Almendinger..... 246
Notes. By G. H. S..... 253

NUMBER 5.

Editorial Comment. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 257
The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. By Rev. M. R. Walter..... 264
The Finality of Conditions in the Future World. By Rev. F. W. Rohlfing 284
The Gods of the Vedas. By Rev. Ernest Schulz..... 293
A Sermon. By Rev. S. Schillinger, A. M..... 309
Notes. By G. H. S..... 319

NUMBER 6.

Universal and Personal Justification. By Rev. R. C. H. Lenski, A. M..... 321
Eph. 1:4, 5. By Rev. Reuben Schmitt, A. B..... 337
The Augsburg Confession. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 353
Notes. By G. H. S..... 379

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXV. DECEMBER, 1905. No. 6.

UNIVERSAL AND PERSONAL JUSTIFICATION.

BY REV. R. C. H. LENSKI, A. M., ANNA, O.

The beginning of the present year (1905) brought a number of continuous articles by C. M. Z. (Rev. Zorn, of Cleveland, O.) in the *Lutheraner,* the official organ of the Missouri Synod, on the subject of "Forgiveness of Sin." The treatment which was here given this simple subject, while beginning with Luther's statement in the Catechism and thus at first keeping to the truth of the revealed Word, deviated at last very much both from the Catechism and anything it contains and from the Old Bible doctrine on justification, which is set forth in so many passages. It seemed to the writer that these article dared not be allowed to pass unchallenged, especially also as they embodied statements and views uttered some years before in the Missourian periodical *Lehre u. Wehre,* which were opposed at the time by Prof. G. Fritschel, D. D., in the Iowa periodical *Kirchliche Zeitschrift,* and by Rev. H. A. Allwardt (now D. D.) in *Theologische Zeitblaetter,* our own publication. Accordingly we challenged the utterances of the St. Louis paper in our *Kirchenzeitung* in one of the May numbers, and pointed out the fundamental errors contained in the Zorn articles and already to be found in the earlier writings of Prof. G. Stoeckhardt (now D. D.) in 1888 and 1889 in *L. u. W.*

We will repeat the statements that were thus pointed out as false.

FALSE MISSOURIAN STATEMENTS ON JUSTIFICATION.

Prof. St.: "The righteousness, the obedience of the One (Christ) is imputed to the many, to all. Now all men

before God are considered as righteous, obedient persons. Justification is imparted to all, and indeed the justification of life, by virtue of which life, eternal life instead of death, is declared to be theirs."[1] "The Gospel declares to every man who hears it that his sins are forgiven, no matter whether he believes or not."[2] "God has reconciled the world in Christ and forgiven the sins of sinners in common."[3] "Here faith constitutes the last link in the whole transaction. Reconciliation with God, forgiveness of sins, adoption are placed on the some line," *i. e.,* afterwards would come in the "last link," namely faith — in reality, according to the Lutheran view, it ought to come in simultaneous with forgiveness, and the "last link" ought to be good works.[4] Now the objectionable statements in the *Lutheraner:* "It is not true that the reconciliation wrought by Christ is one thing and the forgiveness of sins or justification another thing, but reconciliation and forgiveness of sins or justification is one thing which by Christ and in Christ has come upon the whole world." "It is not true, but a coarse and ugly lie, that we, in order to obtain forgiveness of sins and justification in consequence of the reconciliation, must now do something also on our part, namely, believe * * * and that God then forgives our sins and justifies us." (Observe how "believing" is here vilified as "a doing something on our part," thus turning it into a good work. This is the true Missourian fashion — degrade the thing that you would destroy.)

[1]) „Die Gerechtigkeit, der Gehorsam des Einen (Christi) ist den Vielen allen zugerechnet worden. Es gelten nun alle Menschen vor Gott als Gerechte, Gehorsame. Es ist allen die Rechtfertigung zuteil geworden, und zwar die Rechtfertigung des Lebens, kraft welcher ihnen statt des Todes das Leben, das ewige Leben zuerkannt ist." — „Lehre und Wehre", '88, 163.

[2]) „Das Evangelium sagt jedem, der es hört, daß ihm seine Sünden vergeben sind, gleichviel ob er glaubt oder nicht." — „Lehre und Wehre", '89, 84.

[3]) „Gott hat in Christo die Welt versöhnt und den Sündern insgemein die Sünden vergeben."

[4]) „Hier bildet der Glaube das Schlußglied im ganzen Handel. Versöhnung mit Gott, Vergebung der Sünden, Kindschaft werden auf gleiche Linie gestellt." — „Lehre und Wehre", '89, 84.

"Thus it is not true that God in the Gospel announces to us the reconciliation effected by Christ and at the same time tells us what conditions we must comply with, in order that He may now really forgive sins and justify us, namely, that we must believe. Why, before faith is even mentioned, God has justified the whole world and us, and has revealed and given us justification by the Gospel."[5]

OUR CHALLENGE.

In the following statements we drew attention to the errors contained in these Missourian utterances. *In the first place,* God justifies the individual by himself, but this new Missourian doctrine takes no account of this act of God in dealing with the individual, when faith enters his heart, but substitutes for it a "universal justification," which is declared to be identical with reconciliation. Thus Missouri loses the distinctive and most fundamental Lutheran and Biblical doctrine, namely, the justification of the individual believer. *In the second place,* faith is thrust out of its Biblical and Lutheran position in justification. The whole act of God, justifying men, is finished and complete A. D. 33, without faith. Every man is justified, "no matter whether he believes or not." Faith is only "the last link," comes

[5]) „Es ist nicht wahr, daß die durch Christum geschehene Versöhnung e i n Ding und die Vergebung der Sünden oder die Rechtfertigung ein ander Ding ist, sondern Versöhnung und Vergebung der Sünden oder Rechtfertigung ist e i n Ding, welches durch Christum und in Christo über die ganze Welt gekommen ist." — „Lutheraner", '05, No. 7. —— „Es ist nicht wahr, sondern eine grobe und greuliche Lüge, daß wir, um in Folge der geschehenen Versöhnung Vergebung der Sünden und die Rechtfertigung zu empfangen, nun auch an unserm Teile etwas tun, nämlich glauben müssen . . . . und daß uns Gott dann unsere Sünden vergibt und uns rechtfertigt." — „Es ist also nicht wahr, daß Gott uns durch das Evangelium die durch Christum geschehene Versöhnung anzeigt und zugleich sagt, welche Bedingung wir erfüllen müssen, damit er uns nun wirklich die Sünden vergebe und uns rechtfertige — daß wir nämlich glauben müssen. Ehe vom Glauben die Rede ist, hat Gott ja die ganze Welt und uns gerechtfertigt und uns die Rechtfertigung durch das Evangelium geoffenbart und gegeben." — „Lutheraner", 1905, No. 8.

trotting in behind, long after everything is finished. This doctrine on the very face of it destroys "justification by faith;" if we were to name it we would call it justification not *by,* but *unto* faith (similar to "election *unto* faith"). *In the third place,* this new doctrine destroys the old Biblical and Lutheran one, that justification takes place at the very moment faith is enkindled in the sinner's heart. It declares that justification is all done up completely long before the sinner is born, all he needs do now is to believe it — not a word of any act of God concerning the sinner when the spark of faith is kindled. These were the objections we brought up against the Missourian doctrine of justification, as presented in its newest form. Somehow we roused our friends on the Mississippi, as well as him of Cleveland, for several answers at once appeared. But, strange to say, not a word of explanation was offered; on the contrary, we were severely attacked, the wrong statements of Missouri were defended and held fast, and, most significant of all, the correct doctrine, which is known and acknowledged the world over as the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith and is contained in thousands of Lutheran publications, was not avowed as such. We scanned the replies that came very closely for a fair admission that these statements of ours are correct and according to Scripture: 1. *God justifies the individual, namely, in a personal judicial act;* 2. *He thus justifies the individual who truly believes in Christ, therefore no unbeliever;* 3. *He justifies thus the moment faith is kindled in the heart.* Up to the time these lines are being written a really satisfactory admission of the truth of these statements has not been made in any of the answers that we received to our articles. One admission indeed we have, for which we are duly thankful. We shall come to it presently, when we will present it in due form. But even this one admission, where the ink has flowed so freely from the Missourian fountain, has a peculiar look. Why, our sentences above embody, as every man knows, three of the cardinal points in the Bible doctrine of justification. It is strange that a Lutheran set of writers, who claim to be absolutely

sound on this doctrine, should take such a long while in acknowledging any one of these points when they are put forward against them in controversy. For the simple fact is, whosoever denies or hesitates to acknowledge and freely accept these three points in regard to justification is not sound in the chief doctrine in the Scriptures which rules all other doctrines, and therefore, as Luther declares, cannot be trusted in any other doctrine.

THE MISSOURIAN REPLY.

But what answers did we receive? Really only two: *First,* the accusation that we were guilty of rejecting the "old Lutheran doctrine of objective or universal justification;" *secondly,* that the Missouri Synod did really and positively teach "subjective justification." Of course, there were some trimmings to these replies, more or less beautiful (*i. e.,* from the Missourian point of view), but as they appear to be only trimmings we will here confine ourselves to the essentials. C. M. Z. stated in two articles in the *Lutheraner* that our statement was entirely correct: "faith limps on behind,"[6] namely, that God's act of justification was all completed at the resurrection of Christ, and now comes faith "limping on behind" and appropriates this justification. As far as that writer is concerned (who cultivates a peculiar style meant to be excessively forceful, and who thus easily makes extravagant statements) we have had no intimation that he really understands or accepts what our Catechism calls justification by faith, according to Rom. 3, 23. 24. 28; Eph. 2, 8. 9; 2 Tim. 1, 9; Rom. 4, 5; 10, 4; Ps. 32, 1, 2 (Rom. 4, 6-8); Gen. 15, 6 (Rom. 4, 3); Is. 53, 11; Rom. 11, 6. Another reply came from Prof. Fuerbringer, who accused us of denying "universal justification" and referred us to the Report of the first meeting of the Synodical Conference in 1872, to which Conference our Synod then belonged. At the meeting referred to the doctrine of justification was treated at some length, and, because of former disturbances,

[6]) „Der Glaube hinkt hintennach." — „Lutheraner", 1905, No. 12 und 13.

the discussion and theses entered fully upon the doctrine of reconciliation, "universal justification" and absolution, not however ignoring or in any manner denying the doctrine of personal justification, which was plainly set forth in thesis, as well as discussion. Further answers were furnished by the indefatigable Prof. F. Bente, of St. Louis, who multiplied accusations in a bewildering and by no means complimentary manner in *Lehre und Wehre,* and who has since appropriated the defense of the Missourian position on this doctrine as his especial task. But when we scan his replies closely we see that the two things stated above are really the substance of his contention, namely, (1) the accusation that we reject "objective justification," and (2) the declaration that he and Missouri does teach "subjective justification." Before we consider these replies more closely we will state that the *Kirchenzeitung* at once took up the Report of 1872 and placed the main features of the doctrine taught therein before its readers and the Church, pointing out the deviations of which C. M. Z. and Dr. Stoeckhardt were guilty. That was in the issue of September 2. Going a step further, the *Kirchenzeitung* presented also a digest of the volume published by the one-time famous Missourian theologian, Dr. E. Preuss, professor of theology at the Concordia Seminary, in St. Louis, on "The Justification of the Sinner before God. Set forth according to the Sacred Scriptures. Berlin, 1868." Second edition 1871.[7] This volume was praised, when it appeared, by Dr. Walther as the finest thing published on justification during the whole century. That was certainly saying a *good deal.* The fact is, that Preuss sets forth the doctrine in a very excellent manner. He used Philippi a great deal — Philippi, whom Dr. Stoeckhardt attacks as utterly unsound on justification. He makes only the briefest mention of "universal justification" in his treatise, but gives us the fullest and clearest exposition of what all the Church understands and always did understand by justification by faith, bringing out with great beauty and power the very

[7]) Die Rechtfertigung des Sünders vor Gott. Aus der Heiligen Schrift dargelegt. Berlin. Verlag von Gustav Schlawitz.

things C. M. Z., for instance, ignores and sets aside completely, and to which we drew attention especially in the three points of our challenge above. Strange to say, while our digest of the Report of 1872 was briefly touched upon in one of the replies that was made to us, our presentation of "the finest thing written in the whole last century on justification" has not yet been referred to. Possibly this is yet to come, at least we hope so.

THE MISSOURIAN REPLY EXAMINED.

So much for the thread of the story. We now turn to an examination of the double reply so far received. In the *first place,* Missouri answers our challenge by a counter accusation. This is a well-known mode of procedure on their part in previous controversies. Missouri prefers in every way an offensive to a defensive warfare, and there are reasons for the preference. But in this case the attack made upon us is of little moment, and therefore largely a Missourian mistake. This for the simple reason that our challenge contained no denial whatever of "universal justification" properly understood, and that the point of issue we presented was not one on this head at all, but one upon the simple doctrine of personal justification as this is set forth in our Catechism and the appended Biblical proof passages. Let us recall the original situation. Z. publishes eight articles in the Missourian congregational paper for the laity on "Forgiveness of Sin." In these eight articles he does *not* say at any point that God justifies the individual when he believes and the moment faith is enkindled in the heart. He *does* say with his monstrous way of emphasis that justification and reconciliation or propitiation is one and the same thing; he speaks of justification as only the act of God which took place in the year 33, when Christ was raised from the dead, which justification pronounces all men just, declares that the sins of all men are forgiven, no matter whether they believe or not, and that all that need now be done is for us to believe and accept this finished act of God. Here we inquired: What becomes of that act which the Catchism and so many

Bible passages and our whole Lutheran Church calls justification, the act of God which takes place for each individual sinner who truly believes (and for no one else) and the moment faith is wrought? Strange indeed this Missourian reply to our challenging question: You are wrong, you deny "universal justification!" That was not the point of contention at all. We made no issue of what may be termed "universal justification." We wanted to know why Z., when he treated so simple a subject as forgiveness of sins for the people, did not explain personal justification according to the Catechism and the Scriptures, why he made such a strange thing out of it that its Biblical and Lutheran character could no longer be discerned. And for reply we were told: "You are heretics, you deny the old doctrine of 'objective' or 'universal justification.'"

Well, it brings up a new point of issue; but one thing we are determined it shall not do, it shall not turn us from the first and real point we are after: *Is Missouri still sound on the doctrine of personal justification?* Have C. M. Z., Dr. Stoeckhardt, Prof. Bente and Dr. Pieper "reformed" this doctrine?

THE TERM JUSTIFICATION.

But to settle this first point. Let us get into the clear about our terms, first of all. When Lutherans use the term "justification," and especially "justification by faith," what do they mean? Do they mean what is spoken of 2 Cor. 5, 19 and Rom. 5, 18, and what the Missourians are pleased to call the justification of the whole world, having taken place when Christ was raised from the dead, for which they sometimes use the term "universal justification," or what they seem greatly to prefer, "objective justification"? The answer is: No; when Lutherans speak of justification they mean a different thing, a different act of God, one that takes place at a different time and includes only certain specified individuals.

This answer Missouri itself once made in the Report of 1872, above referred to. The twelfth thesis of that Report defines and sets forth personal justification (when God

"declares" "by a judicial act" that "the individual sinner who believes" "is now justified" "for his person and made an heir of eternal life"), and in the discussion we are explicitly told: "This is the justification which is *properly,* according to the language and custom of the Church, called the justification of a poor sinner, because here every individual stands in judgment before God and is acquitted for his own person."[8] The Report deals largely with "universal justification," but when it comes to personal justification it openly and plainly states that this personal justification is what is properly so-called, namely, the justification of a poor sinner. This answer was made once more by Missouri, through Dr. Preuss in the volume referred to above. Remember, it was Missouri which declared repeatedly that Dr. Preuss' book was the finest thing on justification written during the whole century. In his treatise he briefly touches on "universal justification," referring to 2 Cor. 5, 19, declaring: "Yea, before we were born, we were justified in Christ; and then he adds: "This is *not justification,* as it is imparted to us by faith, but as it took place before all faith." Then he proceeds in his whole volume to set forth not 2 Cor. 5, 19 and Rom. 5, 18, or the justification of all men before faith, but on the basis of the old, old Scripture proof for personal justification, "justification as it is imparted to us by faith;" and that no one may get the idea that he supposes this justification to be an act of God identical and synchronous with the other, he tells us that "this act of God takes place in time, and that for every man individually."[9] He even adds: "The justification of Paul did not take place at the same time as that of Cornelius, but as often as a heathen leaves his idols, or a Jew his Talmud and comes to Christ, so often God justifies and much oftener. But of course he must come. For whoever

[8]) „Daß das die Rechtfertigung sei, welche im kirchlichen Sprachgebrauch schlechthin die Rechtfertigung eines armen Sünders genannt wird, weil da jeder Einzelne vor Gott im Gericht steht und für seine Person von ihm losgesprochen wird." — S. 67 f.

[9]) „Diese Rechtfertigung . . . . ist aber eine Handlung Gottes, die in der Zeit geschieht. Und zwar für jeden Menschen besonders." S. 26.

does not come, that is, believe on the Son, will not see life, but the wrath of God abides upon him. John 3. 36." The man who wrote "the finest thing on justification in the whole last century" declares that justification in the *proper* and usual significance of the term signifies God's act concerning the individual believer. But we find a belated testimony to the same effect by Prof. Bente himself, in a note on p. 399 of *L. u. W.*, 1905, where he states: "And as far as the term 'justify' is concerned, we too know very well — to use the words of the *Standard* or rather of the Norwegians — 'that not only in the Scriptures themselves, but also in other doctrinal and devotional books the term justify in by far the most instances is used to denote personal justification or that of the individual sinner.'"[10] Let this statement of Prof. Bente be noted and kept in mind. It is admitted on all hands that the terms "justify," "justification," "justification by faith" DOES NOT usually or properly refer to "universal" or "objective justification," or to an act of God concerning the whole world.

But there is just a little more to be said on this point. That the word "justification" ever did come to be used to *any* appreciable extent for anything else but for the act of God concerning the individual sinner when he believes is due almost entirely to the Missourians. Look over the old dogmaticians and try to find a few statements in which they declare that the whole world is "objectively justified," and how many will you find? The Report of 1872 admits that the dogmaticians used this word for any such purpose "*very* seldom" (p. 44). It then brings a few quotations from the following authors: *John Quistorp* († 1648, Prof. at Rostock), who writes that in one sense "all are justified," namely, as regards the merit *obtained* for us, and in another only "some are justified," namely, as regards the merit appropriated. *John Gerhard,* the well-known great dogmatician, is quoted as saying that when God raised Christ from the dead

[10]) Prof. B. is quoting from an old article in the *Lutheran Standard* in 1871 on the controversy then proceeding between the Norwegians and the Augustana Synod.

He absolved Him, as our Substitute, from all the sins He had assumed, and thus "absolved *us* also" thereby. But Gerhard does not use the word "justify" at all, nor does he say that "the whole *world*" is absolved. *"Us,"* that might mean the world, but it might also mean only the believers in Christ. Accordingly this quotation is of very doubtful value. Even if taken in the sense of Missouri, it is significant as showing how a great Lutheran dogmatician, who has written volumes of material on justification, has used once — say once, or so! — an expression that sounds a little like what some Missourians are now saying so much that they forget to repeat altogether what Gerhard said thousands and thousands of times. Then comes *Gottfried Olearius* († 1715, Prof. in Leipzig), who writes only these words: "We are justified with Him (Christ) in the judgment of God," and then refers to Romans: "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that rose again," etc. Again a quotation of doubtful value. The ordinary reader who is not looking for "objective" justification will take the words of Olearius as referring to justification in the usual sense. Next comes *Johann Jacob Rambach,* who writes in connection with Rom. 4, 25, that "when now our substitute was justified, all the debtors were also justified in him;" again, in connection with Rom. 5, 19, he uses the expression "the justification of the human race was accomplished in a moment as regards the merit attained," [11] note: "as regards the merit attained." Then comes *Adam Struensee:* "If one arose for all, then they all arose and were justified." *Ph. D. Burk,* who uses the expressions "justification as a universal benefit of grace" and "this universal justification upon all men." Finally, *Andreas Rohrberg* († 1767, Swedish court preacher in Stockholm), who writes that when "the whole human race is considered in general as one person," it was "justified with Christ at the same time" when He arose from the dead; then, however, while he holds

[11]) „Die Rechtfertigung des menſchlichen Geſchlechts iſt zwar auch in Abſicht auf die Erwerbung in einem Moment geſchehen, in dem Moment, da Chriſtus auferſtanden und alſo für gerecht deklariert wörden; aber in Abſicht auf die Zueignung geht ſie noch fort bis an den jüngſten Tag."

fast that thus "with Christ all men were justified" he emphasizes that they *"err greatly"* who claim that "a man needs no other justification." [12]

This is about all one can cull from the dogmaticians. At the meeting of the Synodical Conference the greatest theologians of Missouri were present, who knew the dogmaticians as few others did, and this poor collection of quotations is all they could furnish, a few clear enough, a few hardly so. Well, we should certainly say that the use of the word "justify" stands established as *the* term, not for anything universal, but for the act of God concerning the individual person. A clear light falls thus upon attempts like that of

---

[12]) Let the reader observe this galaxy of dogmaticians brought forward as advocates of "universal justification." Take the last three: Struensee, Burk, and Rohrberg — is their fame as dogmaticians or anything else so great that you have heard of them before? Why do we have no quotations from Luther, Melanchthon, Heshusius, Chemnitz (Missouri's favorite), Selnecker, Andreæ, Chytræus? Why no word from Herberger, Hunnius, Hutterus, Leyser, L. Osiander, Mamphrasius, Dannhauer, Quenstedt, Calov or Baier, to say nothing of many others? Well, here is what a few of them on one occasion did say on the subject, and it bears no uncertain sound, like some of the obscure statements presented above: "CONCERNING JUSTIFICATION. We believe, teach, and confess, that no man is rendered or considered just before God who does not appropriate Jesus Christ in true faith and rely upon His perfect obedience. The contrary doctrine is rejected, that a universal justification of all men, even of those who do not believe in Christ, has ever taken place with the Lord our God." This confession and statement was signed by Polycarp Leyser, M. Balth. Meissner, Geo. Mylius, Solomon Gessner, Leonhardt Hutter and a long line of lesser men. And the occasion too may interest us, which called forth such a ringing declaration. Samuel Huber had maintained "universal justification"; he was professor of theology and was deposed from office for his un-Lutheran views. This man Huber, cast forth by the staunch Lutherans of old, Missouri now takes under her sheltering wings. Prof. Bente attempts to defend his views and accepts them for Missouri in *Lehre und Wehre,* Oct. 1905, p. 466 f. Let him look at the statement signed by Huber's colleagues and all the officials of the place when they took measures against this man upon whom *L. & W.* now stamps its approval. But we may have more to say on Huber later.

C. M. Z. in the *Lutheraner* when in writing for the laity he uses "justification" in a different sense from that *universally* employed in our Church. The six or eight expressions of dogmaticians above seem to be enough for this man to base a new definition of this fixed term upon. And then the Missourians are surprised that ordinary Lutherans like ourselves object to this alteration in the principal doctrine of all the Scriptures.

OUR RECORD ON THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL JUSTIFICATION.

But what about our rejecting the doctrine that in Christ and his resurrection all men were "justified?" Well, we have been on record for some time on this point, and it seems strange that an accusation should be hurled at us when in our very first article last May we referred to the article which contains this record. In November, 1889 Rev. (now Dr.) H. A. Allwardt opposed Dr. Stoeckhardt's notions on justification in an article "Another Word on Justification" (see *Theologische Zeitblaetter,* Vol. 8, No. 6, p. 321 ff.), Dr. Stoeckhardt had attempted to use the Report of 1872 against Dr. Allwardt, who therefore writes as follows: "That Report indeed defends the doctrine of a 'universal justification,' but to that Ohio has no objections. Only we maintain that that is not the justification of which we usually speak, which, for instance, is described in the Catechism of Missouri, question 306. * * * Universal justification, however, is first of all and properly speaking the acquittal of Christ from all further punishment for our sin and guilt; His sacrifice for our guilt was asknowledged by the divine righteousness as sufficient. But since He was our substitute we all in a certain sense were justified with Him, namely, in the sense in which 2 Cor. 5, 14 declares: If One died for all, then are all dead. Yet as in this vicarious death of Christ this is not excluded that each individual must yet be embodied in Him by faith before this death can profit the individual anything — we are baptized into His death, Rom. 6, 3, are placed into the communion of His death by regeneration in baptism — and as these two, Christ's vicarious death and our trans-

plantation into it, must be carefully distinguished: just so universal justification and the transplantation into it by regeneration or by faith, and the consequent personal justification must not be confused with each other; the former makes possible the latter, and without the latter the former has no further result for the individual sinner than this, that, by despising it, he falls into deeper guilt. *There is only one righteousness,* which Christ brought forth out of the grave, and which faith possesses; it is complete and altogether valid as it is offered to the unbelieving and as the believer possesses it. Faith adds nothing to it, is not a part thereof; but there are *two justifications* as judgments of God, the one pertaining to Christ the other to the sinner who believes in Christ. Concerning the latter the Scriptures always speak when they say: 'by faith,' 'out of faith,' 'he that is out of faith,' 'if they remain not in unbelief.' It requires monstrous confusion to try to force these expressions of the Scriptures into universal justification, which has occurred once for all and pertains also to those who do not believe. This then is what we have to say on 'universal justification.' Only I would add that in our Church the term has been used very rarely, by most of our theologians not at all. Instead they say 'redemption,' 'reconciliation,' 'propitiation,' etc. And of a man did not want to employ this term at all, because it is liable to be misunderstood, as Prof. Stoeckhardt now misunderstands it, no man would dare to cast suspicion upon him, if only he held fast the truth itself, namely, universal reconciliation." At the end of Dr. Allwardt's article Dr. Stellhorn, in a note, subscribes to the statements made.[13] After these two thus placed themselves on record, and we may say our Synod at the same time, no objections were raised either by Dr. Stoeckhardt or any of his colleagues.

[13]) The entire article deserves study for its clearness and vigor, demolishing the strange ideas advocated by Prof. Stoeckhardt, and hurling a few shells into the camp of Mo., to which our opponents have not ventured to reply. The humor that runs through the article is delightful.

The moment our expression of dissent from the Z. articles was met by the Missourian accusation, that we were rejecting "universal justification," we placed ourselves on record again. In the *Kirchenzeitung* of August 26, where we take up, after patiently waiting for Missouri to express itself fully, the first point of their reply, we state very plainly: "Right here lies the error into which all the Missourian writers who have replied to us have run pell-mell. They all seem to think that we simply reject 'objective justification,' and in their zeal do not distinguish that we reject only the *reformed* (neugefaßte) *Missourian* 'universal justification,' which swallows up or at least damages in a fatal manner the personal justification of a poor sinner who truly believes in Christ." In the next issue of the *Kirchenzeitung*, September 2, in which the Report of 1872 is analyzed, our reply is enlarged by answering the question: "Is there a 'universal' justification?" We answer: "There is a justification that may be so termed; it is described for us in thesis 5" (namely, of the Report of 1872, which is then quoted). Now we do not insist that any man use the term "universal justification," as little as Dr. Allwardt above insisted on it; he may use it if he desires, but if he uses another term that answers as well or better he is entirely welcome to do so, for he follows then the best judgment and unanimous example of our dogmaticians. But we will add what thesis 5 states: "As by the vicarious death of Christ the sin-guilt of the world was cancelled and the penalty of it endured, so also by the resurrection of Christ life and salvation has been brought back for the whole world and has come in Christ as the substitute of the whole world upon all men." P. 40 f. Note well the careful wording of this thesis, it is in strong contrast to the extravagant statements of men like C. M. Z. A third time we placed ourselves on record, when we examined the volume by Preuss, *Kirchenzeitung*, September 23, 1905: "Is there *only one* justification, namely, as Missouri claims, a 'universal' one, pertaining to all men, 'no matter whether they believe or not?' Answer: There are two." Then, taking the words of him who wrote, according to Walther's

own testimony, the "finest thing on justification during the whole century," we describe both: the justification that may be called "universal," and that which to distinguish it from this may be called "personal." Now it seems to us that this ought to be enough, but alas and alack, it is not. Here comes *Lehre u. Wehre* and repeats the old accusation. It seems to have become especially dear to Prof. Bente, this old tune of his, for he plays it for us in his late September issue with all the newest variations: "In its issue May 13, of this year, the Ohio *Kirchenzeitung* rejects the doctrine of universal justification or of the divine absolution of the whole world," etc. "As clearly and strongly as possible the *Kirchenzeitung* thus rejects the doctrine of universal justification or forgiveness of sins." But we ask to be excused from repeating here all the variations of this melody.

Only one more word. These accusations of Prof. B. will do for men who read *only B.* and who accept without reservation all the peculiar interpretations which he is pleased to put upon our statements at present, and all the constructions he places upon occurrances in the past. Other men know exactly what he is doing, and we will not need to state explicitly what that is.[14]

[14]) We append a statement from Dr. Gottfried Fritschel, who strenuously opposed the Missourian innovation. He writes in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift,* 1888, No. 5, p. 143: "If one in speaking of the reconciliation accomplished in Christ Jesus should wish to use the expression, that now since the guilt of the whole world has been paid God looks upon the whole world as justified in Christ, we would have no objections; inasmuch as he (provided he otherwise taught correctly concerning justification by (aus) faith) would thereby simply express this thought that the grace of salvation, the grace of eternal life, the grace of justification has been obtained (erworben) for the whole world; so that now to every individual who embraces by faith the salvation obtained for all the merit of Christ is imputed when he believes, and thus he can personally and actually be justified in the judgment of God." — This statement *L. u. W.* at once rejected as altogether insufficient (1889, p. 75). Very likely we will have occasion to see wherein according to *L. u. W.* this insufficiency appears.

(To be continued or concluded.)

EPH. 1:4, 5.

BY REV. REUBEN SCHMITT, A. B., MARION, IND.

A necessary requirement for doctrinal correctness is correct interpretation of the Scriptures. This thought no doubt directed the debate of the last inter-synodical conference to the Scripture proof for the doctrine of election. The passage, Eph. 1:4, 5, was discussed. It was apparent that in some points of exegesis the views of the contending parties had approached somewhat in the last twenty-five years, but in other points and in the application of the passage they were as far apart as ever. It is scarcely with the hope of being able to bridge the chasm that we present this exegesis. On some points there is simply no compromise. Our purpose is merely to give what we believe to be a correct explanation, to set forth our views and to show that they are in accord with the express meaning of the words used, the context, and the Scriptural usage. For our own satisfaction we may also say that they agree with the analogy of faith and the Lutheran confessions.

To be properly understood this passage must be considered in its connection with the preceding and following verses. Meyer in his commentary gives the line of thought of the first fourteen verses in these words: "After the usual address and apostolic greeting (1, 2) Paul begins by praising God for the salvation in Christ (3), which he presents (*a*) as already graciously predetermined by God from eternity to the praise of His grace (4, 5); then (*b*) as effected by the death of Christ (6, 7), further (*c*) as made known to us in accordance with the purpose of divine love to unite all things in Christ (8-10); and, finally, as appropriated according to His purpose (11). This latter as well in regard to the one time Jews (12) as to the one time Gentiles (13, 14) that they should both be to the praise of His glory." (IV. Ed., p. 34.)

The contents of the vv. 4-14 are but a development of the third verse, the series of relative clauses forming one

extended period. In the fourth and fifth verses the pre-temporal acts of God are described, in the others His deeds which happened in time. They are the particularization of the general act of the third verse, the spiritual blessings wherewith He has blessed us, and are consequently introduced by the argumenative particle *καθώς*, *according as, as* 1 Cor. 1, 16; John 13, 34. A portrayal of the course in which these spiritual blessings have come to us follows. The first act of God which is mentioned here is this, that *He has chosen us*, *ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς*.

Ἐξελέξατο "He hath chosen" for Himself (out of the mass of humanity), elected, *sibi eligere, deligere.* Only the middle voice occurs in the Biblical usage like the Hebrew בָּחַר. "A twofold thought is expressed by בָּחַר. It indicates the *interest of the choosing subject,* which intends the establishment of a relation between itself and the object, and also the *preference of the object* above others of its kind or equally under consideration with it and designates a choice among many." This meaning is fully given by the middle voice, *ἐκλέγεσθαι.* Both thoughts have equal force, though one or the other may have greater prominence according to circumstances, but never to the extent of wholly excluding the other. "It is used to indicate a step in the order of salvation only in the passages Mark 13, 20; 1 Cor. 1, 27.28; James 2, 5; Eph. 1, 4. It has a signification similar to בָּחַר in the choosing of Israel, the preferring selection out of all nations that it might stand in the relation of special possession to God in distinction from the others."

"Only Eph. 1, 4 treats of a pre-historical election, inasmuch as that which is the N. T. congregation as distinct from the world is led back to a pre-temporal act of God and her distinction appears as one already given her before creation, cf. Matt. 25, 34. With that division of mankind before time into such as are ordained to damnation and such as are ordained to salvation is not stated, but the relations resulting from this pre-historical *ἐκλογή* are identical with those resulting from its fulfillment in time, cf. vv. 11-13; 2, 13; 3, 6. The non-election does not already include the

rejection. The distinction according to the N. T. is this that now not Israel and the nations are contrasted, but the ἐκκλησία and the κόσμος resp. κόσμος οὗτος, the latter (cf. v. 22) as the abode of the υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας is doomed to destruction. Not out of a world pre-temporally consigned to destruction, but from the world as it has in time merited this doom did God choose His community to a special relation to Himself" (Cremer). Gerhard's definition, as far as it goes, agrees with this. "*(I) Vocem eligendi includere in sui significatione quondam separationem, qua res vel persona ab alia separatur. Deut. 7, 6 et al.* * * * *(II) Vocem eligendi complecti in se gratuitam dilectionem, a qua originem ducat. Deut. 4, 37 et al.* * * * *(III) Vocem eligendi semper in bono sensu usurpari nuspiam autem in malo.*" L. VIII, § 26.

God has performed the act of election in such a manner that He has in His mind placed some persons in preference to others in a closer or different relation to Himself. The selection has been made out of free and unmerited grace and does not in itself include the rejection of the others.

This gives in the briefest form the meaning of the word ἐκλέγεσθαι as it is used in this passage. Whatever lies beyond this must be given by modifying terms or by the context.

The aim of this act of election is our glorification. (See below.) The fate of those not elected is finally eternal damnation. The election marks already in eternity the division of mankind into two classes. Hence the choice of some involves the practical rejection of the others, just as the choice of one alternative always implies the rejection of the other, or as a remainder always results when a less sum is subtracted from a greater. But mark well, this thought does not as such lie in the term itself; it is a conclusion warranted by the facts in the case. The word is never taken *in malam partem.* Only the positive side is brought out. God for obvious reasons proceeded by a process of selection and not of elimination. Some were chosen, the others left in their

deserved state of sin and punishment, hence, virtually rejected. It is a fact implied but not stated.

Much stress is quite correctly laid upon the fact that ἐκλέγεσθαι is an act of God's free grace, as we find the word even used directly in connection with ἀγαπᾶν and ἐλεεῖν, Deut. 4, 37; 10, 15; Is. 14, 1; 41, 8. This does not, however, say that the election may not have been done in accord with some self-imposed order; that God, so to speak, may not have gone through some thought processes before the act of choosing; that He may not have had regard to some other activities of His, as, for instance, not only His love and His mercy, but also His foreknowledge both of Christ and of our faith in Him. Free and arbitary are not synonymous. And considering that the eternal election and the temporal fulfillment correspond fully, and the decisive part played by faith in the latter, what is there in the word ἐκλ. to hinder us from saying that election is in foresight of faith? This again is no direct proof. It is mentioned only to show that the opposite, as has been attempted, cannot be proved from this word. A statement lately appearing, "In this connection God's foreknowledge for other reasons is not to be denied, but it is not at all necessary for forming the conception, 'to elect,'" is correct. But where the two are mentioned together the combination is by no means impossible.

It is a reversal of the correct procedure to attempt to determine the meaning of the verb ἐκλέγεσθαι from the verbal adjective, ἐκλεκτός, and then to define the verb as meaning simply "to cause one to be an elect," ("zueinem ἐκλεκτός machen"). The conclusion, drawn from this definition of the word and from the fact that the adjective is used as a designation for the same persons who are also called πιστοί, ἅγιοι, κλητοί ἠγαπημένοι, that therefore the verb ἐκλέγεσθαι is synonymous with "to call, convert, spiritually awaken, to lead from darkness to light, to lead to eternad life, justify, sanctify, etc.," is also incorrect. A mere comparing of the adjectives would not, however, justify the inference that thereby we wish to make ἐκλεγέσθαι equal to καλεῖν. It would show that these terms are mutually co-extensive but not

synonymous. They designate the same persons, but widely different processes. If we give all those other activties as a definition of the ἐκλ, we are guilty of extending the term beyond its actual meaning.

It is a step in the same direction when the definition of ἐκλ. is given as "electing *in an effectual working sense*"; if it is said that it means "elect in this effective sense, that it is the first act of God which secures (sichert) our salvation," if it is considered as "a beneficent doing, a doing from which there results in time what the apostle afterwards relates." As far as the etymology of the word is concerned we have given a definition which is acceptable to those who make these additions. Why should they now seek to put something into the meaning which is not there? They do not seem to realize that this, too, is going beyond the Scriptures, and that to these words which they add we can apply their catchword, "that is not there."

The connection does not demand such an explanation. There is nothing to show that the ἐκλ is the source whence the succeeding acts flow. It is simply mentioned along with them as of no greater importance than any of the rest. That it is mentioned first does not mark it as the source whence all the rest flow, for there were other motions of God's mind which preceded it, as "Lehre und Wehre" has admitted; the counsel of salvation logically precedes that of election (namely, of persons). In speaking of God the logical sequence is the only one there is, for in Him there is no time.

The chief support for this expanded definition of the word seems to be found in the analagous use of the word in the O. T. The word used in the LXX. and in the N. T. is the same, and the idea, though fuller, richer and clearer in the N. T., is also practically the same. But it is manifestly incorrect to declare from the fact that the same word is used in this passage that, therefore, the eternal election of God to salvation is exactly similar to His choice of Israel to be a peculiar people unto Himself. This seems so evident to us that it really needs no further proof. It

might perhaps be interesting to take up all passages and examine this proof in detail. Perhaps we should only find that a tried, old process had been repeated. It is this: you place the meaning which you desire to prove into certain passages, then you deduct it from them again, and lo, you have gained a vast amount of erudite proof for your contention.

Neither would it be in harmony with the correct definition of the word to say that it means to resolve, to determine, or simply, to choose; nor could we properly say here that it means to choose or elect a certain plan. The object is persons and not things. He hath chosen *us*, ἡμᾶς. Thus the apostle writes to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus. Taken in its strictest sense the ἡμᾶς means only the apostle and those to whom his letter is addressed. That would leave the passage without any consolatory or dogmatical value, a mere historical statement. But we here, as also elsewhere, make the correct assumption, that as God has done by the apostle and the Ephesians He will also do by us. This is not an exceptional case, and wherever there are people who have so responded to the will of God that they are ἅγιοι and πίστοι then they, too, are elect. God has therefore chosen all Christians, all believers. It is but an instance of the working of the general plan of salvation; people believe and then they are said to have been chosen. This eternal act is always described from the point of view of the present. We are not taken back into eternity and asked to view God's acts from that point, but we are taken as we are in time and some of things which God has done for us in eternity are told of us.

What we are definitely told here is this that election extends only to those who are in the faith. Or as "Lehre und Wehre" correctly has it (Vol. 26, p. 184): "Out of the mass of blind heathen, of fallen mankind, those who now believe are chosen, selected from eternity. . . . . Concerning all those who have ever believed on earth, all those who now believe and who will surely be saved and in the

end attain the heavenly heritage the apostle says that God has elected them before the world."

The act of our election is described as having taken place in Christ, ἐν αὐτῷ. There is an explanation of this phrase of which the worst that can be said is that it is becoming antiquated. By it the phrase ἐν αὐτῷ is construed as a modifier to ἡμᾶς, is made equivalent to τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ or ἐν αὐτῷ ὄντας, and becomes a powerful support for the doctrine of an election in foresight of faith.

This explanation, is of course, sharply assailed by Missouri and her allies. In "Lehre und Wehre" we read: "It is grammatically impossible to construe ἐν αὐτῷ as a modifier of ἡμᾶς. In that case a Greek would have been compelled to write ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ or ἐν αὐτῷ ὄντας. Nor would any one else understand the words, God has chosen us in Christ, to mean God has chosen us who are in Christ. How the apostle expresses such a thought is shown us in Rom. 8, 1, Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ literally translated, therefore now no condemnation to them in Christ Jesus. As the connection of the ἐν αὐτῷ with the object ἡμᾶς is in no wise indicated, it can only be considered as a modifier of the predicate, ἐξελέξατο. We were not in Christ, but God has chosen us in Christ, the election is performed in Christ. According to current Greek usage that means that the election is effected by or through Christ. Luther has correctly translated and at the same time explained correctly, 'wie er uns denn erwählt hat durch denselben.'" Vol. 26, p. 229. This is still the extent of their argument. It was repeated at Ft. Wayne with the reference to some authorities.

On the other hand we may refer to Winer, who writes (p. 364) in regard to the words, in Christ, "This expression always refers to the being in Christ generally in a concise manner," and explains it as "in the most intimate, liveliest communion with Christ (through faith"). The thing which above all else must decide this question is the Scriptural usage. Grammarians may say that such a construction is impossible, but the fact is that it occurs, and one fact is

worth a hundred theories. We refer to the passages, Rom. 6, 11; 8, 10; 16, 3. 8. 9. 10. 12. 13 cf. especially v. 11! 2 Cor. 5, 17; Eph. 2, 13; Phil. 3, 9; 4, 21; 1 Thess. 4, 16; Philemon 23; 1 Peter 3, 16. In all these passages the sense is evidently, to be in . . . , and the article as well as any form of εἶναι are missing. They suffice to disprove completely the impossibility of such a construction. There is indeed a disposition on the part of some of our opponents to admit that the construction without the article may occur, but they will not admit its use in this passage.

So we may, if we wish, do as the Fathers did, construe ἐν αὐτῷ as a modifier of ἡμᾶς and translate as if it were written, ἐν αὐτῷ ὄντας. Such a translation gives the sense correctly; it does no violence to the meaning of the words; it does not conflict with the N. T. usage nor with the analogy of faith.

If others contend that the article or the participle are not there and that the Holy Spirit does not need our assistance in supplyling missing words in order to express His meaning correctly, I for one, should not wish the question of substituting a Greek participle to stand between us, but would rather seek another explanation which, while giving the sense correctly, is also acceptable to them. We find it, if we take ἐν αὐτῷ as a modifier of the verb. Our election, the act, took place in Christ, that is, in the sphere of Christ.

When they have taken this common ground with us we should expect them to abide by it and leave well enough alone. But straightway they have accepted this explanation, they begin to limit and curtail and explain it away. They say that this can possibly only mean either that we are elected for the sake of Christ, or that our election is carried out along the lines of the general way of salvation, that is, through Christ. And then they have stepped back into the identical spot where they stood twenty-five years ago.

In support of their view they make much of the fact that the preposition ἐν is not always taken in its literal sense and may in places mean, through, by, for the sake of, etc. There is no question that ἐν can have a great variety of

meanings and that it is used to express the most varied relations. (Cf. Blass, p. 127 f.) But that it *can* be taken in a different sense than "in" does not by any means say that it *must*. There is no reason at all why we should depart from the literal meaning of the word. It is dealing flippantly with the Word of God if we, for the sake of our notions, presume to change the language of the Holy Spirit. If He had wished to say that we are elected through Christ, He could have used the preposition διά here just as well as in the succeeding verse. The reference to Luther's translation does not prove anything, for in the sixth verse he translates ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ, in dem Geliebten; the construction is the same in both verses. Neither does the use of the phrase in the third verse demand the change of the preposition, for there, too, we may paraphrase in Christ, in the sphere of Christ. The purpose which underlies their virtual rejection of the explanation, in the sphere of, is no doubt their desire to hold fast to their old error that the merit of Christ is considered here only objectively and not subjectively, as the reason and cause for our election. They wish by all means to keep the faith of those that are elected from coming into consideration, for that is but an opening for that, to them, dreadful heresy, the *intuitu fidei*.

In the sphere of Christ means not only in the sphere of His person but also of His work, and indicates the sole basis and cause for our election. It is *the causa meritoria*. But it is not only the merit of Christ as it is acquired, *acquisita* that is the *causa meritoria* of *our election* but as it is appropriated by faith, *appropriata*. (Cf. Baier, ed. Preus, p. 572.) For it is only by faith that we can be in community with Christ, in His sphere. God elected us in the sphere of Christ. That says not only that He elected for the sake of Christ (that would have been διὰ αὐτοῦ), but also that He elected us who are in the sphere of Christ.

The objection, that by such an explanation we change the adverbial modifier of the verb which tells where the action took place to an adjective modifier of the object, which

tells where it is, is not valid. It may be well to note again what this action is that took place in the sphere of Christ. It is not a mere choosing, but a choosing of certain definite and direct objects. The ἐκλέγεσθαι used in the middle voice retains its transitive character and requires an object to complete its meaning. The ἡμᾶς is a part of it, belongs to it to give it its full meaning. The two, both the verb and its object, belonging together, are in the sphere of Christ. Or in other words, if the sphere of an action is Christ, the objects of that act must also be within that sphere, or else they would be beyond the sphere of the action itself. That is, if we were not in Christ, the election that is in Christ could not apply to us. One statement is as incorrect as the other if we say God has elected, without reference to Christ, us who are in Christ, or God has elected in Christ us, who are not in Christ. This latter is practically the Missourian view, even though they have said (see above) that it is the believers and only they who are elected.

Explaining as Missouri does is sailing in dangerous waters. It is like steering a rudderless ship past Scylla and Charybdis. Such explanation, freed from the control of God's Word, leads irresistably into one of two depths of error. It tends either to Huberism, for if God elected for the sake of Christ, merely objectively considered, then He elected all the redeemed, in fact all men. Though this tendency seems to have cropped out again lately in regard to another doctrine, Missouri has consistently held fast to the doctrine of a particular election and has always laid stress on the fact that God has elected certain particular persons. If she has escaped the rocks of Huberism she has then been lost in the whirlpool of Calvinism. For *in exactly the same way the Calvinists speak of an election in and through Christ.* The statement of "Lehre und Wehre" (Vol. 27, p. 357) that the Calvanists do not teach an election in and through Christ, is, to put it mildly, not in strict accord with the truth. (Cf. Frank, Theol. F. C. IV, 193, 291.)

It was but a step farther in this direction when at Ft. Wayne, under persistent urging of his opponents that the

merit of Christ merely objectively considered could not be the reason for the choice of particular persons, that what is present as a cause for all could not possibly be used as the cause for the exclusive choice of some, Dr. Stoeckhardt declared that the reason for the choice is to be found in the εὐδοκία, why God elected just us is to be found in the εὐδοκία, because it pleased Him, why He could elect us at all, in the ἐν Χριστῷ That was a statement which did not mark an approachment, but rather a greater divergence. When a Lutheran theologian gives vent to such utterances what can we say? The most appropriate would be what "Lehre und Wehre" has to say about the modern German professors who, while holding orthodox chairs, teach modern theology applied to themselves. We wonder if the outspoken doctor would to-day write as he did some years ago: "Furthermore, these agree with our explanation, not only the later exegetes, Meyer, Harless, but also the most famous exegetes of the seventeenth century" (L. u. W., 27, 125), or if he would adopt the frank confession of Dr. Pieper also for this case, "The Fathers do not agree with us." If any one wishes to know what the Fathers have to say on this point he can find the most of it in "Error of Missouri," under the "Intuitu Fidei," by Dr. Schmidt.

This election took place πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, before the foundation of the world, before time, from eternity. καταβολή does not mean a foundation as distinct from a subsequent erection, but as contrasted with the later continuance. Cf. Col. 1, 5 ff.; 2 Thess. 2, 13; Matt. 25, 34; 1 Cor. 2, 7; 2 Tim. 1, 9. We are elected "that we should be holy and without blame before him," εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ. The purpose of our election is indicated by this clause. As this can only be our eternal salvation, the holiness and blamelessness of our walk in this life, sanctification, can not be meant here, but rather the holiness and blamelessness as the judgment of God on the basis of the merits of Christ (v. 7). It is not a subjective and imperfect but an objective and perfect holiness. ἅγιος indicates the positive and ἄμωμος the negative side.

Rom. 3, 21 ff.; 5, 1 ff.; 8, 1. 33 ff.; 1 Cor. 6. 11; Heb. 10, 10. 14. 29.

"L. u. W." (26, 237) writes incorrectly: "Furthermore, a holy walk in love is a necessary consequence of faith and acceptance to filiation. Therefore the apostle inserts in his speech the words: εἶναι * * * ἐν ἀγάπῃ, v. 4 b. God has also elected us to this purpose (the infinitive εἶδαι denotes purpose) that we should be holy and without blame in love." In the first place, this explanation is based on the false assumption that an election unto faith is taught in the Scripture. Then there are other weighty reasons against it. If the apostle were speaking of a holy life we should expect him to use γίνεσθαι and not εἶναι. This holiness and blamelessness would have to be perfect already on earth, which it is not, for it is presented as acceptable before God, κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, before Him that judgeth, judice Deo, Col. 2, 14; Rom. 3, 20; 4, 5. But only the righteousness of Christ availeth before Him. This passage would then also be entirely exceptional, which it is not, for in no other one is holiness and blamelessness of life given as the aim of election. The apostle would also have introduced a thought wholly foreign and unrelated to his whole presentation, which is altogether objective, and even where he speaks of the appropriation there is not a word said about sanctification. The explanation of Meyer and Harless coincides with ours. The latter says in effect that to use the other explanation would destroy all connection in the line of thought and make the first part of the epistle an arbitrary conglomeration of ideas.

V. 5. The words ἐν ἀγάπῃ in love, follow. Many expositors have let them belong to the fourth verse, either as modifying ἐξελέξατο, from which they are however too far removed, or as modifying εἶναι ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους. Thus the Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Missouri and many others. The connection of the line of thought is against this construction. If we have explained ἅγιος and ἄμωμος correctly as based on the redemption of Christ (v. 7), the modifier would have to be ἐν πίστει and not

ἐνἀγάπῃ. Harless finds a second and third reason in the doctrine of the apostle as taught elsewhere and in the usage of the language. Following his precedent, as well as that of Meyer, Augustine, Bengel, Griesbach, Lachman, Tischendorf, and many others, we shall let ἐν ἀγάπῃ belong to προορίσας. "It was in love that God predestinated us to υἱωθεσία. The divine motive is placed first for the sake of emphasis." "In love having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν. προορίζειν signifies the determining to a certain end and also the arrangement of the means for the attainment of this end. The objects of the προορισμός are the same as of the ἐκλογή, namely ἡμας, we, the believing readers of the epistle and the apostle.

These are predestinated unto the adoption of children, εἰς υἱοθεσίαν. Υἱοθεσία, from υἱός and τίθημι, to place as a son. It indicates the adoption as well as the relation resulting from it. Through the adoption man steps out of the condition of a child of wrath into that of a child of God. Rom. 8, 15; 9, 4; Gal. 4, 5. It is the revelation in which believers now stand with God, a relation which does not end with time but extends into eternity. It marks the present phase of an eternal good, or, it indicates a condition in time which culminates in eternal glory. Rom. 8, 17; Gal. 4, 7. In only one passage, Rom. 8, 23, it signifis merely the eternal inheritance. Yet this thought may not be excluded from the Word, for it is here used to indicate the purpose of our predestination.

The paragraph which treats of predestination closes with the fifth verse; if the thought "salvation" is not included in υἱοθεσία, the line of thought remains unfinished and the presentation of the doctrine is incomplete. Cf. vv. 11, 14. In this sense the F. C. uses this passage, § 5, and presents the adoption of children and salvation together as the end of election, § 24.

The purpose, which causes "L. u. W." (26, 236 ff.) to attempt to exclude this idea from the meaning of the word

υἱοθεσία and to declare that the signification "inheritance" is solely demanded by the context in Rom. 8, 23, is betrayed in the very next page. There we read, 26, 237: "The conception πίστις, faith, is included in the conception υἱοθεσία διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This is a canon of Scripture: 'Ye are all the children of God *by faith in Christ Jesus.*' In and with faith we become children of God. It is therefore altogether according to Scripture to say: God has elected us unto faith." The doctrine "God has elected unto faith" is accordingly "clear Scripture." It is indeed true that "ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." God has determined that by faith and by faith alone we should come to salvation. But where is there one word of all this in this passage? "L. u. W." itself admits that it is only a *conclusion* drawn from Scripture: "What we necessarily conclude from Eph. 1, 5." But it is not only a conclusion but also a false one, for which not one explicit statement of the Bible can be cited as proof and which is wholly out of harmony with its spirit. It is based on an arbitrary narrowing of the conception υἱοθεσία and a false explanation of the words, εἶναι * * * αὐτοῦ v. 4b. And if they appeal to 1 Peter 1, 1. 2 as if this doctrine were there "explicitly expressed in clear words," that is not the case. For also in that passage they are compelled to draw a conclusion before they can present faith as the end of election. Attention should be called to the fact that "L. u. W." has correctly stated that God elected only the believers, 26, 184. What nonsense then to say that God has elected those that already believe to faith. The expression εἰς υἱοθεσίαν corresponds fully to the συμμόρφους * * * ἀφθαρσίᾳ, Rom. 8, 29. "L. u. W." has explained those words correctly to mean the future glorification (26, 226). But here as there the purpose of election is given. It is not only the adoption of children for time, but it is our ultimate completion and glorification. It is gratifying to us to note that the restricted definition of "L. u. W." does not at present find acceptance in all quarters of the Synodical Conference. The "Quartalschrift" lately printed an article in which the reten-

tion of the eternal phase of the υἱοθεσία is vehemently insisted upon. Only its author should not have done Rev. Fiebke the injustice of accusing him as saying, "God has elected * * * not to glorification, but to filiation, that they should come to faith and become God's dear children" when in fact he writes, "The apostles speak * * * not only of an election to glorification and to eternal life * * *, but they speak of an election to filiation and to eternal life, Eph. 1, 5." The εἰς αὐτόν shows with whom this relation is to be formed, namely with God. It cannot be with Christ for it is accomplished through Him. The διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ scarcely demands any further explanation.

It is further stated that we are predestinated "according to the good pleasure of his will," κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, according to the favor of His will. Εὐδοκία means, according to Cremer, the free good will (willingness, choice) whose content is something good, favor, will of grace. Of God's gracious will, Matt. 11, 26; Luke 10, 21; Eph. 1, 5. 9; Phil. 2, 13; Luke 2, 14. θέλημα is the will, or decree of God, that which has seemed good to Him and has been determined by Him, that determining of God which leads to action. All things are effected by the θέλημα of God, also our predestination. But in those things which belong to our salvation it is the will of God directed by love. The θέλημα is qualified by the εὐδοκία, which indicates the general state of mind in which the resolution is formed. We are predestinated according to the will, not of absolute might, but of grace.

In "L. u. W.," Vol. 26, p. 228, we find about as much Calvinistic error and as many incorrect statements in regard to this phrase as it is possible to crowd into a few lines of type. The Canvinistic afflatus must have been very potential at the time when those words were written. We are there informed that κατά indicates the cause of our predestination, "κατὰ gibt hier, wie oft den Grund an." The cause then must be the εὐδοκία. So we see that Dr. Stöckhardt did not say anything new when he declared at Ft. Wayne that the reason why God has chosen us is to be found in the

εὐδοκία. (See above.) This statement occurs: "The Holy Scriptures testify that God has elected and predestinated us κατὰ τὴν εὐδ. τ. θελ. αὐτ., according to the good pleasure of His will, Eph. 1, 5, or, as is written instead, Eph. 1, 11, κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τ. θελ. αὐτ., after the counsel of His will." But the phrase κατὰ, etc. in v. 11 is not a modifier of προορισθέντες but of ἐνεργοῦντος! It seems scarcely credible that any one could make such a mistake. Then, of course, this follows: "βουλή, counsel, and εὐδοκία, good pleasure, are synonyms." But they are not. βουλή is the will or purpose, as the result of deliberation, counsel, resolution. The definition of εὐδοκία we have already given. Both the English and German versions give this distinction very nicely. We read further, "In the εὐδοκία there are two ideas; it indicates a *firm* decree (as already in classical usage) as well as a *gracious* decree of God." The word, unfortunately for the Doctor, does not occur in the classics, but only in the LXX and N. T., where the only idea which it expresses is the one given by him as the second. The German of Luther must also suffer; "Wohlgefallen" is not to mean favor, good pleasure, good will, but "was mir gefällt," what pleases me, what I determine. In quoting Harless he forgets to add to the phrase, "according to the gracious decree of His will" the words, "or, simply according to the grace of His will." Then he speaks of finding the reason for the choice of persons in this place. No one but a Calvinist, or a Missourian, would attempt such a thing. What he says on this point is altogether beside the mark. So is also his expansion of the thought that this is a very secret and very mysterious will of God in regard to which we dare ask no questions and need expect no answers. He seems to have failed to notice the ninth verse, "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will." This will is beautifully and clearly taught us in the Holy Scripture. Through God's Word and God's Spirit we have learned to know it, and it has been rich in consolation for us. It is by no means secret and arbitrary; it is a *voluntas revelata et ordinata.* It is given us in Christ Jesus. (Cf. Luther's Expl. of v. 9.)

The pre-temporal decree for our salvation has been formed "to the praise of the glory of his grace." How it is carried out is told us in the verses 6-14. These verses to a certain extent furnish an explanation to the preceding verses. It would extend this article unduly to include them also. The purpose and the ultimate aim of all this is the glory of God. We are predestinated to salvation to the praise of the glory of His grace; we should be to the praise of His glory; we are sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise until the redemption of the purchased possession unto the praise of His glory. All that pertains to our salvation from the first motions of divine love to our own glorious consummation in eternity is to the glory of God.

THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

BY PROFESSOR M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

II. AT THE DIET.

That which made the Diet of Augsburg so memorable in the annals of time is chiefly the presentation of the great Confession of the Evangelical Lutherans. There were other topics engaging the attention of Church and State in that splendid assembly of high dignitaries, but there was none of such momentous import as the work of Luther and the mighty movement which was in progress because of his persistence in preaching the Gospel in spite of the opposition of emperor and pope, kings and cardinals. Even the great political questions of the time faded into relative insignificance before the vast concerns of the Christian faith and man's eternal salvation.

After the second Diet at Spires in 1529, which annulled the comparative freedom from persecution accorded to the Lutherans three years before and which gave rise to their famous Protest, the Protestant princes made their appeal to a free General Council. The emperor was evidently willing to grant this, but the pope, who was afraid of free councils

and from whose power Charles V was unable to extricate himself, would not consent. He therefore convoked the diet at Augsburg, promising to attend it in person and to give an attentive hearing to the Protestants, who were asked to prepare a statement of their faith and their grievances.

When the Diet assembled, which was to be on April 8, 1530, but was afterwards postponed until May 1, although the emperor's appearance was delayed for several weeks even beyond that date, the Lutherans were ready. During the time which elapsed between their entry into Augsburg and the coming of the emperor they were not idle. The Lutheran princes had their preachers busily engaged in preaching the gospel throughout the city, and the people heard them gladly. Great multitudes thronged the churches to hear the good tidings; one church after another was opened to the Protestant preachers; even in the cathedral Lutheran services were held. The city was profoundly stirred, and the Papists, who could not fail to observe the mighty power which the gospel exerted among the people, became more and more alarmed and embittered. Information of the commotion in Augsburg was conveyed to the emperor, whose delay was evidently becoming more trying to the Papists than to the Protestants. Three of the bitterest enemies of the Reformation, Elector Joachim, of Brandenburg, and Dukes George, of Saxony, and William, of Bavaria, went to meet the emperor at Innsbruck to consult about the situation. They were bent on mischief and not at all scrupulous about the truth, so that Melanchthon, on May 18, wrote to Luther that they had probably gone to the emperor to consult about the necks of the Lutherans. Their efforts were directed towards prejudicing the emperor against the noble Elector of Saxony on account of the Evangelical preaching, which they represented as almost causing riots in Augsburg. This they presumed to have been his object, as he was suspected of harboring evil designs. They even offered to furnish military forces to oppose the elector. These representations were not without influence on the emperor, who was, seemingly against his own judgment, largely swayed by the

influence of the pope and his following. Accordingly he complained to the elector that he had not been faithful in carrying out the edict of Worms, which required that Luther should be captured and that his followers should be crushed. It must be remembered that this edict had been virtually repealed by the Diet of Spires in 1526, and could not now be appealed to in proof of any dereliction by the elector. But this was not all. He demanded that the elector should put a stop to the preaching of the gospel at Augsburg. That was expecting too much of a sincere Christian man. The elector wrote to the emperor in reply, that he must for conscience' sake most humbly decline to forbid the promulgation of the gospel, as nothing was preached but the plain truths of God and Holy Scripture, and that it would be dreadful to forbid the Word of God and His truth. Moreover, this would be a stumbling-block to many and would look as if his Imperial Majesty designed to prohibit the doctrine of the gospel without giving the matter a hearing, notwithstanding that his call convoking the diet had given assurance that the whole subject should be duly considered in a Christian spirit, and he certainly would not desire that his word as published to all the world should be disregarded. His Majesty was also entreated not to give so much heed to the enemies of the Evangelical faith, who were doing their utmost to prejudice his mind against the truth.

In another respect the long delay of the emperor, who did not arrive in Augsburg until the 15th of June, inured to the advantage of the Protestants, severely as his dilatory course, which kept them waiting so long for the opening of the diet, tried their patience. It gave them more time to put the finishing touches on their Confession, at which Melanchthon worked assiduously every day. As the time between the emperor's summons of the diet and the date fixed for its meeting was very short, the work of preparing the document was done in haste, and the severe literary taste of Melanchthon was not fully satisfied with the form which it had assumed. As regards the contents there were no lingering doubts in the minds of the Protestants, and the im-

portant document could have been presented to the diet without hesitation in the same form in which it had been delivered to the elector at Torgau in March of that year. The Schwabach Articles, principally the work of Luther, and the Articles on Abuses, drawn up by Luther, Melanchthon, Jonas and Bugenhagen, as they were embodied in the confession delivered to the elector, adequately expressed the faith and hope of the Lutherans, and there was no wavering among them. They were ready to present their testimony when they entered Augsburg in the early part of May. As to its substance the whole work emanated from Luther, who was best qualified to give expression to the faith and life that pulsated in evangelical souls during those Reformation times. In respect to the contents he could justly claim that the Augsburg Confession was his work. And yet it was not his faith alone that was to be confessed before that august assembly, but the faith of all those who received the pure gospel which the Holy Scriptures teach and which he preached. It was the faith of the whole Protestant host that was to be confessed and maintained, and it was befitting that this should be clothed in the best possible form. Therefore, while the emperor delayed his coming they continued to direct their principal attention to the due preparation of their confession. Princes and theologians, who were to appear before the diet as evangelical Christians confessing their Scriptural faith in allegiance to Christ, in protest against papal usurpations and errors, were alike anxious to make their work worthy of the great occasion. The materials which were ready at hand were therefore committed to the skillful hands of Melanchthon, who virtually acted as secretary, for further elaboration in form and style, that the confession might not only clearly express their common faith, but satisfy all the demands of a refined taste in its expression. Day after day Melanchthon, the acknowledged master in matters of style, labored while the emperor delayed, to make the Augsburg Confession, in consultation with the other confessors, more and more that masterpiece among Evangelical Confessions which all the world acknowledges

it to be. Alas, that all the world has not the faith which it so beautifully confesses!

On the 15th of June the emperor finally arrived at Augsburg. His coming was with all imperial pomp and pageantry, and he was received at Augsburg with all the reverence due to his exalted position. When the reception ceremonies and addresses were over, the papal legate extended his hands to pronounce the papal blessing. The emperor and the whole gorgeous assembly bowed their knees to receive it as the holy Roman father's benediction. But seven princes, those who were about to deliver the glorious Augsburg Confession in testimony of their evangelical faith, did not bend the knee. Were they soured and sullen, stubborn and contentious? God knows how their hearts yearned for the peace of the gospel and the benediction of Heaven upon all men. But therefore they desired the blessing of the Lord Jesus, not of the pope, and would not place themselves in a false position by any seeming concession to popery and its pretensions. They resolved to bear their testimony from the start against Romish error and for the truth of the gospel which they came to confess. They were ready to suffer, but not to deny their faith — not even by an act which to less tender consciences might seem excusable.

But this did not end the trial to which their faith was subjected on that occasion of the imposing display of emperial splendor. After the pomp was past and the lords were retiring, the emperor requested the Protestant princes to remain. He then ordered that the preaching of the gospel should finally be discontinued, and announced that on the following day their participation in the Corpus Christi procession was expected. This was rightly regarded by them as the result of Romish influences upon the emperor. For years such processions had not been held at Augsburg. Besides this it was customary at the assemblies of the princes to let each one decide for himself in what religious celebrations he would take part, if indeed he chose to take part in any. The emperor had therefore no ground to expect such participation by the Protestants and seemingly to test their

loyalty by such an announcement. It was manifestly inspired by papal craft. The Protestants remonstrated against the unusual and unwarranted requirement, but the emperor angrily replied that he would insist upon it. What then, in the presence of such pomp and power, should the poor Protestants do? They could flee for refuge and strength to the Lord their God. He was their ever present help, for it was in His name that they had set up their banner, with no reliance upon an arm of flesh. The aged Margrave, George of Brandenburg, accordingly stepped before the emperor and with the firmness familiar to faith replied: "Rather than deny God and His holy gospel, and accept a false and erronious opinion I would here, on this spot, kneel before your Majesty and have my head struck off." The earnestness of the Margrave, manifestly expressive of the spirit of all the Protestants, did not fail to make a salutary impression on the emperor. No doubt to the chagrin of the Papists, whose will he had been executing even beyond his own conception of right and reason, the emperor answered in a kindly voice, "Dear Prince, not head chopped off." But the orders were not revoked.

The Protestants were given time until the following morning to decide what they would do. In the evening they consulted and on the next day, in the name of them all, the Margrave of Brandenburg set forth at some length the reasons why they could not take part in the proposed ceremony. He declared that their participation in what the emperor designed to be a religious celebration would, on their part, be a partial assent to a proceeding, as of divine right, which the Scriptures do not recognize, and would thus be understood as a denial of their principle that only the Word of God must rule in matters of faith and conscience. Therefore they could not comply with the emperor's requirement, desirous as they were to be obedient to the "powers that be," so long as this could be done without a violation of their conscience, which is bound to obey God rather than men. The emperor failed to accomplish his purpose, but still firmly expressed the hope that the Protestants would

find it possible to participate in the ceremony. They did not. The result was, as a historian of the times expresses it, that "our princes returned to their lodgings and left the emperor with other electors and princes to hold their procession." In regard to preaching it was at last agreed that for the time both parties should refrain from publicly proclaiming their tenets in the churches.

Meantime the filing and polishing of the Confession which was Melanchthon's special charge, but the delivery of which at the declaration of their faith was the great concern of all the evangelical princes and theologians, went on, that nothing might be left undone to give it clearness and elegance. For various reasons it was not deemed wise that Luther's precious life should be jeopardized by his personal presence at Augsburg, though his counsel in the great work of preparation for the approaching testimony before the diet was felt by all to be of paramount importance. He accompanied the evangelical confessors as far as Coburg, that he might be as near the diet as possible without leaving German territory, and was in constant communication with his brethren at Augsburg. Although he could not attend the conferences which they held in those anxious days of suspense and trial, when clouds hung heavily over them, his thoughts were hourly with them, and his prayers to God were unceasing for their success. Melanchthon kept him duly informed of the work done on the Confession. When this was sent to him in the revised form on May 11, he wrote: "It pleases me right well, and there is nothing that I would change or could improve. Nor would it be expedient for me to do so; for I cannot tread so gently and so quietly. May Christ our Lord grant that it may bear much fruit, as we all hope and pray that it will." There was not a Christian at Augsburg more intensely interested in the work going forward there or participated more solicitously in its progress than Luther in his watch-tower at Coburg. "With sighs and prayers," he writes to Melanchthon, "I am in truth faithfully at your side. The cause concerns me also, indeed more than any of you. It has not been begun lightly

or wickedly or for the sake of honors or worldly goods. In this the Holy Ghost is my witness, and the cause itself has shown it until now. If we fall, Christ falls with us — He, the Ruler of the world! And though He should fall, I would rather fall with Christ than stand with the emperor." His faith and prayers as well as his voice and pen were thoroughly enlisted in the evangelical cause which was engrossing the thoughts and moving the hearts of thousands of noble Christian men and which was now reaching its great crisis at Augsburg.

The Diet was opened on Monday, June 20. A solemn mass was celebrated in the cathedral, which the Lutherans attended, but without taking part in the services. The papal nuncio then made a savage attack on the Germans for their evangelical faith, representing them as worse than the Turks, who were causing the emperor some trouble and whose case was also to be considered by the Diet. Thus at the very outset the spirit of the Romish party was indicated, and left the Protestants but little room to hope for fair treatment. The outlook was dark around them, but the hills of God were bright, and they had learned to look up. In a case like theirs all help of man is vain. They knew this right well, and therefore looked up to the hills whence their help cometh. Having faith, they were not dismayed. The next step in the Diet was not so menacing,, though it was by no means reassuring. In the address made on behalf of the emperor there was at least a little more moderation than in that made by the nuncio in behalf of the pope. He had the clemency to declare that the religious question which caused him solicitude, and which would occupy the attention of the Diet, should be dealt with in the spirit of charity and kindness. But unjust accusations were at the same time made against the Protestants. Troubles which had arisen were ascribed to their neglect of duties imposed by the Diet of Worms. In both addresses the Lutherans were represented as the offenders, though the temper of the emperor was less fierce than that of the pope. Neither afforded the

evangelical Christians any reasonable hope of justice, much less of charity.

In the evening the Elector of Saxony called his Lutheran colleagues together and admonished them to be steadfast in their faith and its profession. They were in peril, and in their time of trial they all needed encouragement for the conflict that was before them. The Lord God Almighty was with them, and they had nothing to fear. But the faith of Christians often becomes weak in the day of temptation, and they need encouragement even when, from the standpoint of trust in God, there is not the slightest reason to be dismayed. On the following morning the elector desired to be left alone. He entered his closet, prayed long and fervently, and went over the Confession again with critical care and earnest solicitude as in the presence of God, before whose judgment bar he desired to be ready at any hour to give account of his stewardship. He thus endeavored to be prepared for giving unqualified utterance before the Diet of the faith of his own heart as well as that of his brethren in faith and in tribulation. The Lutherans left nothing undone to fortify themselves, through the power of the Holy Spirit speaking to them in the Holy Scriptures, with the full assurance of faith, so that whatever might betide they might be certain that God is with them and would bless them. All the historical documents of the time, in letters of high purpose in humble reliance on divine guidance and narratives of corresponding deeds, make manifest the childlike confidence in God's promises which actuated those brave confessors in those days that tried men's souls.

It was agreed that the subject of religion, which was agitating all hearts, and which was confessedly of the most momentous import, should have the first place in the deliberations of the Diet. The emperor designated Friday, June 24 for the purpose, and ordered that the Lutherans should be ready on that day to present their cause. They were ready at any moment. With them it was not a small matter

for which the needful preparation could be made at some convenient season of leisure. They had for years been earnestly considering the questions involved; they had drawn up their statement before the Diet met; and all the days of their waiting at Augsburg had been spent in revising and perfecting the important document. On Thursday the evangelical estates were convened at the house of the Elector of Saxony, the Confession was again carefully read and considered, and all of them signed it. There was nothing lacking in the preparation for their great historic work when the morning of Friday dawned. They were quite ready, but the emperor was not. He had other interests that occupied him more than that which was the great life question in the souls of the Protestants, who were seeking first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. All the indications were that the papists had no desire to hear the Confession or to have it publicly read. They rather dreaded it. Slanderous reports had been circulated about the doctrine as well as the life of the Lutherans, and it was not to the interest of their adversaries to let the light of truth shine among the people. Not only would the foul misrepresentations of the Romanists be exposed if the Lutherans received a hearing, but the abominations of popery, which these misrepresentations were designed to serve, were also likely to share in the exposure. The policy of the papists therefore was, if possible, to prevent an open declaration of their faith and purpose by the Protestants, as this might break down many a refuge of falsehood on which the papal party built their hopes of victory. Other business was represented as needing immediate attention and the pressing subject of religious dissensions was pushed aside. Thrice did Dr. Brueck, who was ready to read the Confession, entreat the Diet to give it a hearing. The second time, after a matter that was declared to be urgent had been settled, the emperor alleged that the day was now too far spent for the public reading, and suggested that the purpose of the document could be attained by handing it over to him, promising at the same time to give it all duce consideration. No doubt the Luther-

ans felt that, if this were done, their righteous desire for a public hearing of their Confession would be frustrated. In their behalf Dr. Brueck pleaded that they had been grossly maligned in regard to their doctrine and practice, and that justice and fairness required that they should be allowed to give an account of their faith before all people; wherefore they humbly entreated his majesty for God's sake to grant them a public hearing. Finally, the emperor yielded to the arguments and entreaties of the Protestants, and consented that their Confession should be publicly read on the following day.

With little sense of fairness the emperor had taken the precaution that this reading should not take place in the great hall of the council, where the public sessions of the Diet were held. In the estimation of the papal party that would not be expedient, as it would enable a multitude to hear it. It was therefore ordered to be read in the chapel of the episcopal palace. Accordingly in the afternoon of June 25 the princes and deputies assembled there to hear the Confession. Dr. Brueck held in his hand the Latin, Dr. Mayer the German copy, the latter being the one appointed to be read. Again the emperor manifested his disposition to prevent, as much as in him lay, the effect of the public reading. He demanded that the Latin copy, which would not have been so generally understood, should be read. But the Elector of Saxony urged that they were on German ground and therefore hoped that his majesty would permit the use of the German tongue. The emperor deemed it prudent to yield, and Dr. Bayer read the Confession in a loud and measured tone, so that all could distinctly hear every word of the grand testimony to the truth in Jesus. Thousands of people, who had heard of the imperial arrangement, gathered in the court outside of the chapel, and through the open windows the ringing tones of Dr. Bayer's voice were heard as clearly by the multitude as if they had been within the walls of the small chapel, which would accommodate only about two hundred persons. In spite of the emperor's shrewd scheme to prevent the public proclamation of the gospel of grace in

Christ for man's salvation, God in His good providence prepared a way to have it heard by a vast concourse of eager listeners, many of whom praised the Lord for the glad tidings they were premitted to hear in those troublous times. "That was a day," writes Spalatin, "on which one of the greatest works that ever occurred on earth was done— a day on which a Confession founded on Holy Scripture and written in such quiet mildness in Latin and German was read, the like of which had not been seen for a thousand years, nay, not since the world stands." "I am exceedingly glad," says Luther, "to have lived to this hour, in which Christ by His so great confessors, in so great an assembly, has been preached in so glorious a Confession, and the Word has been fulfilled, 'I will speak of Thy testimonies before kings,' and this also has been fulfilled, 'and shall not be ashamed;' 'for him who confesseth me before men' — these are words of Him who cannot lie — 'I also will confess before my Father who is in heaven.'" The trumpet tones of gospel truth and liberty that sounded forth on that 25th of June in 1530 are ringing in the ears of the world until this day, when millions are still rejoicing in the precious treasure of the glorious Augsburg Confession. Shall not we, favored sons of such noble sires, hold high the banner on which it is inscribed?

The emperor was not delighted, as were the evangelical Christians, at the precise and precious proclamation of the truth unto salvation by faith in Christ presented in the Confession, though there was much in it that evidently found a lodgment in his heart. He made known, indeed, that he received it graciously; "But," he added, "as this is a matter of great moment and requires mature consideration," he would give it further thought and communicate his decision later. Having taken charge of the Confession and ordering that it should not be printed without his consent, he closed the glorious day's proceedings.

As the Confession set forth the pure gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to all them that believe, it could not fail to impress many earnest hearts which were not reckoned among the Lutherans. Some of these were

pricked in their consciences, and some were convinced that the Protestants had been basely slandered; while the thorough-going papists, who were intent only on gaining a victory over the bold monk of Wittenberg and wreaking vengeance upon him for his alleged insolent attack on his superiors, were chagrined beyond measure. It produced a tumult among them. The bitter enemies of the gospel could not answer the questions proposed by minds more seriously inclined, and they would not acknowledge their defeat. Not only some of those high in authority were led to doubt their papistic foundations in the light of the clear testimony of the gospel, but even the emperor himself could not wholly conceal its disquieting effect upon his conscience; and it is still a question if he did not at last, when death came, flee by faith for refuge to that Saviour whose merits were proclaimed by the Lutherans at Augsburg as the sinner's only hope of salvation.

After hearing the Confession the papistic party held a counsel to determine what should now be done. A declaration of their faith and aims, that inquiring minds might have an opportunity to compare them with the clear and candid statements of the evangelical Confession, would now have been in order and eminently proper. It might even seem that this would be the only reasonable course from their own point of view, as they would thus compete with the Protestants for public favor by setting the two contentions side by side and inviting all to examine and judge for themselves. Such a course would have been in accord also with the avowed purpose of the emperor in convoking the Diet, the call for which recognized the existence of unhappy dissensions on questions of religion. These should be settled, and to this end each party in the controversies was expected to present its case. But a course which seems so reasonable and so manifestly demanded by the circumstances did not commend itself to the judgment of the more radical and reckless followers of the pope, whose policy even the emperor was not at liberty to ignore. They sought out inventions to evade what they thought a dangerous path, even if they did

not fully realize the futility of arraying darkness against the light. It was a crafty device of their theologians to deny that the Protestants were on an equal footing with the adherents of the pope, and that these were under the same obligation to state and defend their position as the former. They argued that they were the party in power and in possession, while the Lutherans were in rebellion against the constituted authorities and had the duty to submit and obey their superiors, instead of claiming equality with them. In those times of ignorance such arguments had force, even upon honest minds. The light which the Reformation brought and which now shone in splendor upon Augsburg through the great Confession, had not yet penetrated the hearts of the people, and the fallacy of the Romish contention had not yet become generally apparent — alas, it is even not yet apparent to thousands of people who call themselves Protestants, but have never fully purged out the leaven of popery, which still vitiates their thinking and disturbs their peace!

The papistic theologians thought it plain enough that the pope and his cardinals and bishops and priests were the Church, and that the Church had supreme authority on earth. They did not know better, and they refused to learn better, assiduously as the Lutherans endeavored to impress on them the heavenly truth declared in the Bible. Asserting this claim they thought themselves invulnerable, notwithstanding that the fundamental principles of the Reformation had been proclaimed as the very truth of God revealed from heaven, and had been victoriously maintained from the Scriptures against all objections and assaults of the papists. They would not learn. They adhered to their custom and their slavery, and supposed that an appeal to the miserable order of things as they existed was sufficient argument to make all popish ordinances respectable and acceptable. But were they willing to formulate their claims, as these had come to be understood in their superstitious and tyrannical practices, and to assert them in opposition to the teaching of Holy Scripture and the sighing of sincere souls

for release from bondage as those had been set forth and voiced by the Augsburg Confession? That was a ground which they saw to be too perilous to venture on. They preferred to make no explicit declaration of their faith as against the Lutheran confession of gospel truth, with its appeal to Holy Scripture as the decisive Word of God. This was prudent not only because no opinions of men could have any weight of evidence in opposition to the decision of God, which must stand in all eternity, but also in view of conditions with which human reason must reckon. The papistic confession of human traditions and notions and policies and contrivances presented a labyrinth that was inextricable even for the craftiest of Romanists. What could they present as the settled doctrine and decision of the Romish hierarchy, which they claimed to be the Church of Christ? In every way they occupied unsafe ground, and every step was perilous. They could not without the greatest danger venture upon a declaration of principles and policies which might result in dissensions and disputes among themselves, and especially not when any declaration would necessarily be set against the simple gospel confessed by the Lutherans. The council was perplexed, and opinions were divided. Some advocated violence as the only effective means of overcoming the so-called stubborn heretics. It was argued that peace would be secured only by the utter extermination of the Lutherans, and it was accordingly urged that only fire and sword could remedy the existing evil. Others were decided in their conviction that in the present crisis such extreme measures would not be good policy. No doubt some of those who opposed the scheme of blood and murder were impelled to withhold their assent to such sanguinary expedient by other thoughts than those of prudent policy. The emperor and some of the princes were disinclined at once to resort to the sword as the best means to maintain their cause. Only in one point there was apparent unanimity among the Papists: they must not yield the prestige which they had in the possession of power. They had the advantage and meant to maintain it. Therefore the Lutherans must not be treated

as their equals in the contest. It must not be conceded that the Protestants were entitled to have their cause adjudicated before an impartial tribunal which should accord to both parties the same rights. According to their conception there were not two religious parties whose controversy was brought before the judge of heaven and earth and must be decided by His Word, but a heretical party on trial before the Church which must pronounce judgment, notwithstanding the fact that this alleged church was the other party to the controversy, and its usurpation and abuses were fundamental points in the dispute. They were shrewd enough to perceive that if they admitted their cause to be on trial as well as that of the Protestants, and that both must be judged by a higher court than that which they claimed to be the Church, which meant that they must themselves be judge and jury, their case was well-nigh hopeless. If the whole matter was to be referred to the tribunal of the Great King in Zion, before whom Papist and Protestant alike must give account, the Word of that King must be decisive, and that is just what the opponents of the gospel dreaded. To them it was essential that their authority usurped by the pope, should be maintained and that thus the leaders of their party should be the supreme judge between them and the Protestants, whose condemnation was therefore a foregone conclusion. Against this Romish begging of the whole question at issue and tyrannical exercise of power which the Papists had unrighteously arrogated to themselves the evangelical Christians could not do otherwise than persistently protest, and unswervingly make their appeals to the Word of the Lord, which is written for the learning of all men in Holy Scripture.

As the sanguinary party could not carry their point, looking to the termination of the religious dissensions by the extermination of the Lutherans, the deliberations of the Romanists resulted in the appointment of a committee of theologians to examine and refute the Confession of the Protestants. This cannot be but regarded under the circumstances as an additional evidence of the salutary effect pro-

duced by the evangelical testimony at Augsburg. It was something of a concession that the papistic party was willing to give the Protestant Confession such distinguished consideration. It was hazardous to meet the Lutherans on their own ground, and many felt it to be a condescension. The truth confessed was exerting its heavenly power on the souls of men; and if the resolution adopted by the council of the Romanists does not prove that many of them were affected by it and impelled to give it careful examination, it undeniably does prove that it was working to such an extent that a refutation was regarded imperative. Among the men selected for this work were the ablest leaders of their party, including those who were known to be the bitterest enemies of the Reformation, such as Eck, Faber, Wimpina and Cochlaeus.

These men of Romish might, who were eager for the fray, at once went zealously to work; and in a little more than two weeks they were ready to submit to the princes of their party a bulky composition which was called a "Confutation" of the Augsburg Confession. But the document was in no respect a brilliant success; in fact it was a dismal failure. The emperor received it on the 12th of July; but on the 15th it was returned with the criticism that it was entirely too diffuse, superficial and violent, and with instructions to make it more modest and more thorough. For men as vain as Eck this was a hard medicine to take, but there was nothing to be done, considering the high source, but to take it and suffer the humiliation. Apparently the commission, in their hot and hasty zeal, had overlooked the main business for which they were appointed. Instead of subjecting the Confession to a rigid examination they had expended their energies upon a violent reiteration of the calumnies in vogue among the populace against Luther and the Lutherans. Spalatin reports that the "Confutation" consisted of 280 manuscript pages, but that when the emperor was done with the sifting to which he subjected it, only 12 pages remained. It was mortifying. Luther remarked concerning

it that "poor carpenters make many chips and spoil much choice wood, as ungodly scribes daub much good paper." No wonder that Eck, who was the master mind of the commission, was almost driven to desperation and could give vent to nothing better than the remark, that the emperor was himself to blame for their intolerable trouble with the Lutherans; for if he had heeded the counsels of the pope and his faithful advisers, he would, when he entered Germany, have attacked them with fire and sword, and the cause would have been won by putting them all to death.

Notwithstanding the discouraging reception of their first effort, the Romish theologians went to work again in the hope of producing something more satisfactory to the authorities, who no doubt seemed to them rather hard to please. On the 3d of August they presented their "Confutation" again. This time it was in a form which the emperor, after numerous revisions, thought fit to be read before the Diet. This was done in the same place where, more than a month before, the glorious Confession of the Lutherans had been read. But it lacked everything that made the Augsburg Confession of the Protestants glorious. The light of the gospel did not play around it, and the power and comfort the great evangelical Confession was not in it. Like the first effort it was a failure in all matters essential to the great controversy, although from a merely human point of view it was in some respects less objectionable than the first. On August 6th Melanchthon wrote to Luther: "Faber never wrote a book so silly and so awkward that this Confutation is not more silly and awkward still." It was difficult for the Lutherans to repress merriment at the feeble efforts of their adversaries to support their contentions by Holy Scripture, at which they were novices. The matter was too serious to indulge in ridicule, but the Protestants could not otherwise than feel elated by the papistic failure to support their cause by any grounds that could appeal to the Christian conscience; and Spalatin writes that all upright and reasonable men were consoled and encouraged when they heard how childishly and inaptly the Confutation was writ-

ten. For the papal party the situation was proportionately disheartening. Those who were more reasonably and righteously disposed could not but admit that they had been defeated in the grave contest.

It was now as perplexing to decide what further to do as it was after the Lutheran Confession had been publicly read and the power of its heavenly truth was felt throughout the Diet. The Confutation had not convinced sincere enquirers that the Protestants were in error, and the weak product of the strongest papal theologians with all their strenuous effort naturally intensified the doubt whether the cause of Rome could be maintained by any legitimate appeal to human consciences. At a meeting held after the reading of the Confutation the Bishop of Augsburg admonished his colleagues to exercise caution that nothing be done against the Scriptures or in violation of justice and equity, as it was manifest that the confessors of Luther's doctrine had not assailed or desired to impugn a single article of the Christian faith; and when another bishop vehemently remonstrated against such concessions and charged that the views expressed were in conflict with those maintained but a few days before, the Bishop of Augsburg replied: "I do not deny that in my life I have done many things which were evil and culpable, but the present time and occasion impel me to renounce all malice, to abandon the evil lusts of the flesh, and to begin a different life. And that I may conceal nothing, perhaps the life of Your Grace has not been more pious and godly than mine; but your purpose compared with mine is so much worse and more terrible as you endeavor with the greater obstinacy to excuse your vices, to cloak the idolatrous abuses, and to defend and maintain ungodly doctrines." The participants were embittered and the meeting became stormy. But nothing was done, or could be done by a party divided among themselves, to secure peace between them and the evangelical confessors. Notwithstanding their internal dissensions and their inability to give a Christian reason for their adherence to the papal cause, they persisted in their opposition to the Protestants. The emperor de-

clared that he accepted the position of the Confutation, alleged that the Confession of the Lutherans had been refuted, and expressed the hope that they would return to the old religion. Under the circumstances this could only mean that the Protestants were required to renounce their evangelical faith which, though it was the faith of God's people in all generations, they should vilify as an innovation in the kingdom of Christ, and return to the papal house of bondage with all its abominations and miseries under the pope.

The reasonable request of the Lutherans, that a copy of the Confutation should be furnished them, only added to the confusion of the Papists. All could see its propriety, but not all would see the expediency of granting it. They were perplexed about it. From their point of view it would not be prudent to submit the weak document to the scrutiny of the strong men of the Augsburg Confession; but neither would it seem prudent to submit themselves to the reproach of dreading to have their work examined. They chose what appeared to them the less of the two evils confronting them, and refused to grant the request. The papal legate, Campegius, who had shown himself to be a wily diplomatist, had previously expressed the opinion that it would not be wise to enter upon a discussion of the Lutheran doctrine, because its advocates would have little difficulty in rendering it plausible to the common people. He recommended that no copy of the Confutation should be given out, lest this should give rise to new contentions. Their conduct made it apparent that they felt their weakness. The Jesuit Massenius confesses that their refusal to give the Protestants a copy of the answer to the Confession justly made the impression that they did not have great confidence in their cause; and with some appearance of candor remarks that the Lutherans have more expert controversialists than the Romanists, and also had the further advantage that they based their contentions on the one foundation of Scripture, while the Romanists wandered about in the wide field of various interpretations, of the writings of the Fathers, and of the decrees of councils.

At last, amid the manifold embarrassments of the situa-

tion, the emperor concluded that it would be best to give the confessors a copy of the Confutation, provided that they would promise under oath not to publish it or a reply to it. Such conditions they, of course, could not accept. No doubt the papists felt perfectly safe in making such an offer, as the Lutherans could not honorably accept it, and the document would be useless to them if they did accept it. They stood fast in the faith of the Augsburg Confession, and firmly refused to adopt the opinions of the Confutation or in any way to be bound by it, whatever the Diet might decree.

Apparently the whole matter was thus settled. All efforts to effect an agreement had failed. The Lutherans had presented their Confession, and their consciences being bound by the Word of God and their eternal salvation being at stake, they had done what they could. Much as they prized peace, there was nothing that they could yield, whatever might betide. The Romanists had drawn up a paper which they called a Confutation, and the Lutherans were required to accept it. They could not. Though the papists were in power and therefore assumed the authority to compel the acceptance of their decision, it could not be accepted. The evangelical believers were ready to be condemned as heretics or rebels, or whatever the party in power might doom them to be called, but they were under no conditions ready to prove disloyal to their Heavenly King and to renounce their faith in His Word. Therefore the rupture was inevitable. As our fathers at Augsburg spoke because they believed in the Lord and His precious gospel, there was no choice for them but to stand by the truth which they professed and become known in the world as the Church of the Augsburg Confession.

Although they could not obtain a copy of the so-called Confutation, they resolved to make a reply to its allegations and claims. Many had heard it read, and some had taken notes. Melanchthon, Although he was not present at the reading, was induced by inclination as well as by solicitations and by the circumstances generally, to prepare the reply. This was called the Apology of the Augsburg Con-

fession, which is a masterly exposition and defense of the Lutheran faith, and which was rightly assigned an important place in the Book of Concord containing the public confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. In the preparation of the work he used the notes taken by Camerarius. "On September 22, the first draft of the Apology was offered to the emperor by Dr. Brueck, immediately after the reading of the first recess of the Diet. It was received by the Count Palatin Frederick, in the name of the emperor, but returned when his brother Ferdinand whispered something in his ear." There was no further notice taken of it by the Diet, in whose second recess the Confutation was promulgated as its official decision. Melanchthon subsequently obtained a copy of the document, and continued to work on the Apology until it was brought to its present state of completeness as a recognized masterpiece of confessional clearness and vigor.

As a matter of fact the presentation of the Lutheran Confession at Augsburg and of its alleged Confutation ended the Church relations between the Lutherans and the papists. They were inwardly divided and outwardly separated. The papal dream of supreme authority could not bind them together and make them a unit. There was a gulf between them which no human pretensions or contrivances could bridge over. The emperor was angry at the persistent refusal of the Lutherans to submit their faith and subject their consciences to the dictation of the pope or the decision of the Diet. According to the prevailing views of the time, that meant culpable obstinacy. But the light of the gospel had come again and shone in the hearts of the Protestants. In the high matters of conscience and eternal salvation they had learned from the Holy Scriptures to hear and obey only when God speaks. Neither pope nor emperor could be admitted to have any authority against the Lord of all. The die was cast, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Augsburg Confession was forced to take its stand, whatever the consequences might be, for Christ and His revealed truth, against the Romish sect that would not submit to the

Word of the Lord, but boasted of its power to compel all others to submit to its usurped authority.

The radical and rabid party among the papists thought that now assuredly the emperor would resort to physical force, which they regarded the only efficient means of subduing the supposed stubbornness of the Lutherans. Some of the Protestants also expected such a result, and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse was no doubt actuated by such thoughts when, on the 6th of August, he secretly departed from Augsburg. But counsels of moderation still prevailed in the Diet, and renewed efforts were made to unite the divided hosts. A committee, composed of members of both parties, was appointed to devise a way of peace. But it failed of its end, as it could not otherwise than fail as long as the popish party refused to let the Lord reign and accept His word as decisive. The fanatical Elector of Brandenburg, as the chief spokesman of the papal party, sought to subdue the Lutherans by threats, which he thought would be potent for their subjugation, because unquestionably the pope and the emperor had the power to execute them — if the Lord of all did not reduce their potency to perfect impotence! But the Protestants cared nothing for papal threats. Should the worst come they declared themselves ready to sacrifice not only all their earthly possessions, but even their lives, in order to preserve a good conscience before God and save their souls from everlasting death.

Nothing was accomplished, but hope was not abandoned. A second committee, composed of fewer members, was appointed to make another effort toward conciliation. It consisted of fourteen persons — two princes, two jurists, and three theologians on each side. Eck, Wimpina and Cochlaeus represented the Romanists; Melanchthon, Schnepf and Brenz represented the Lutherans. These discussed the questions in controversy from the 16th to the 21st of August. For a while their endeavors seemed more promising of results. But while there was a temporary prospect of peace it was at the expense of the gospel. Another time of probation had come for the evangelical cause.

Luther was not present at Augsburg, and now he was greatly needed. Melanchthon was expected to take the lead in the maintenance of evangelical truth, and though he had done noble work he was not equal to the task before him now, where a Luther was needed. He was a man of peace and unduly timid withal. It is difficult to speak of the work of this commission without censuring his weakness at a time when the occasion demanded unflinching strength. He hesitated and vacillated when he should have stood forth as the bold confessor of eternal truth. The fact is undeniable that his lack of qualification for leadership when faith was put signally upon trial, as it was on this occasion, threatened disaster to the whole cause of the Reformation. He did not show the firmness, especially against men so unscrupulous and so resourceful in subterfuge as Eck, which was befitting the humble disciple of Christ who absolutely bowed to the Lord's word, whatever might come of it. By Romish craft an agreement in terms was effected on some important points, while the words were so chosen as to admit of a Romish sense. Peace seemed secured, but without a distinct declaration of evangelical truth. Even in the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith Melanchthon consented to a compromise, which did not indeed expressly deny the Lutheran confession, but which rendered this liable to a false construction in the interest of Romanism. Luther, who always looked at things in the clear light of the gospel, replied to a letter of Melanchthon's in which the matter was reported to him: "You write how Eck was forced to confess that we are saved alone by grace; would to God that you had forced him to quit lying." Melanchthon was pressed on all sides by the shrewd Romish theologians, and, sincere Christian though he was, he was unable in his weakness to withstand all the solicitations and artifices of the cunning adversary. He was thus allured into concessions which were not even in accord with the faith of his own soul, and he himself as well as his Lutheran brethren suffered for it. But God still ruled, and He had no concessions or compromises to make. The wily plans which menaced the evangelical cause

must fiaally come to naught. When the papists pertinaciously insisted that the Protestants, if they were determined that the Holy Supper should continue to be administered in both kinds, must not teach the people that this is done by divine command and that the withholding of the cup from the laity as practiced in the Romish Church is a violation of God's ordinance, Melanchthon's conscience overcame his timorous love of peace, and neither he nor his colleagues could be induced to make such a concession. Our Lord's plain "Drink ye all of it" could not be put aside to gratify the pope. The Lutherans declared that the Church must administer the sacraments according to the divine institution, and that the people must be taught what the Scriptures teach. By the grace of God the danger that was threatening the Church of the Augsburg Confession was thus averted. The negotiations were brought to a close, and the commission reported that no agreement could be effected. A third effort, the committee being still further reduced in number and only Melanchthon and Eck being engaged as theologians in the negotiations, was also without result. Melanchthon, invigorated by the letters of Luther, became stronger and steadier in the maintenance of gospel truth, and was no longer disposed to make dangerous concessions. The Lutheran princes now announced their determination to enter upon no further negotiations concerning their Confession, as their faith rested upon the Word of God and they therefore could yield nothing. They accordingly renewed their appeal to a general council, and the Augsburg Confession remained intact as the declaration of the evangelical faith.

Virtually the business of the Diet was thus finished, so far as the Lutherans were concerned. Being justified by faith they had peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ and they would stand by their banner. They had taken their position with many prayers and amid many conflicts, and knew whereof they affirmed. What true love could do in fidelity to the Scriptures to prevent a final rupture between them and the papists they had done. Now the difference

was seen to be irriconcilable, and they took their divinely appointed place in the world as the Evangelical Church, with the banner of the Augsburg Confession floating over them to mark their separation from Rome as a distinct Christian organization, but at the same time to show forth their loyalty to the Head of the Church and His blessed Word recorded in Holy Scripture as the Church of the pure Word and Sacrament, and thus the true visible Church of Christ on earth.

But the Diet still continued its sessions. On September 7, after hearing the determination of the Protestants, the emperor informed them that he had heard with displeasure and grief that in the chief articles of faith they were still disagreed with the other estates; that he had not supposed they, who were comparatively so few, would presume to make such innovations in opposition to the holy customs of the Christian Church and maintain a doctrine which is inconsistent with that of the pope, of his majesty, of King Ferdinand, and of all the princes and estates of the realm; and that it could not be permitted that the matter should be thus left undecided and free course be given to the innovations; they must be resisted and abolished. With a seeming sense of justice he at the same time promised to see that the pope granted the general council to which appead was made, but with manifest injustice he appended conditions which rendered the promise nugatory.

Everything indicated that the emperor was guided by the wishes of the papistic party, and was not inclined to show the Lutherans any favor. He continued to harp on the fact that these were a minority and should therefore in modesty and meekness submit to the judgment of the greater number, especially as these were in power and could enforce their decisions. In pursuance of the same sophistry he urged that it would be dreadful to pronounce his ancestors and other good princes in error by admitting the contention of the Protestants. His logic was as lame as that of the Romanists usually is. But potent as it was to mislead the thoughtless partisans, it was impotent with those whose faith rested on the Word of God. They were sure that what the

Lord revealed from heaven is true, and they were not disturbed by human fears and threats of disorder and disaster if this truth be accepted. They were intent on the salvation of their souls and of those who would hear their confession, and were content to leave all consequences to God, who gave the gospel for the enlightenment and comfort of men, not for their criticism and subjection to the test of expediency as human reason is able to see it. Happily for us and for all the world they were men of faith, who held fast to the Scriptures, whether others would hear or forbear, and were therefore sure that their confession would stand amid any and every storm, as the Word of the Lord endureth for ever.

On the 23d of September the Elector of Saxony left the Diet in the conviction that nothing more was to be done there for the cause of the gospel. It still remained in session for several months longer, and on the 19th of November the final recess was published. The emperor remained firm in his opposition to the Lutherans. They were condemned, and fearful menaces were pronounced against them. But they, by the grace of God, were firm in their faith, and were not daunted by the threats of emperor and pope. They trusted in the Lord, and He made them strong, so that they did not fear what man could do unto them. They were unjustly dealt with; the powers of earth were against them, but God was with them, and they carried the glorious banner of the Augsburg Confession to victory.

NOTES.

BY G. H. S.

SPECIAL LUTHERAN WORKS.

Without a doubt our readers will all be keenly interested in the autobiography of our venerable Dr. M. Loy, just published by our Book Concern, under the title "Story of My Life." It is a handsome octavo volume of 440 pages, embellished with portraits of the author at every period of

his life and of churches in which he preached when pastor, and of prominent men who labored together with him in making the Joint Synod of Ohio what it is. This general interest on the part of our readers is all the more fully justified, because the work is really an inner history of the Joint Synod during the past six decades and tells the story of the growth of the principles for which this body stood and stands. In this respect the work as an autobiography is a unique production. While the personality of the author, the ups and downs of his life and career are fully reported, these really all stand only as a background for the development and growth of the solid Lutheran principles and practices which it is the glory of the Joint Synod to represent and maintain, and for which our body, under God, is indebted more to the work of Dr. Loy than of any other man who is or may have been an active factor and force in making the Synod. While the author also exercised a potent influence in the external growth of our Synodical body, it is very clear from these pages that his work in its inner development was such, that the Joint Synod of Ohio would now not be what it is had it not been for the writer of this book. The book is, however, anything but a self-glorification of the author for this exceptional work of his; it is rather a glorification of the principles for which his life stood and stands, while to his personality is assigned a modest position in the background. The work accordingly has a positive historical value for our Synod, supplementing in a most welcome way the official history of the Ohio Synod by Schmidt and Peter. Pastors particularly will profit by the study of this life, as it demonstrates with convincing evidence that Biblical principles, truths and practice, in the Synod, the Church, the family and the individual life are always sure of the best permanent results. It "pays" to adhere to Scriptural precepts and behests and teachings. Naturally it is impossible to enter upon the details of this autobiography, every page of which is replete with instruction and interest for an open hearted and open minded reader. To each one we say, Tolle! Lege!

Dr. Jacobs, of Philadelphia, has published a new English Dogmatics, entitled "A Summary of the Christian Faith" (General Council Publication House, Philadelphia, $3.00, pp. 637). That in general this is an excellent work goes without saying. It is substantially a reproduction of the old orthodox Lutheran System of Dogmatics, with only a limited reference to modern phases of dogmatical discussions. In fact, this latter feature is not as strongly represented as it should be in a work intended for the twentieth century. An example of this negative weakness is the rather unsatisfactory handling of the problem of the Scriptures, which is now the cynosure of all eyes in dogmatical debate. In other matters the work is exceptionally good. It is particularly gratifying that on such controverted subjects as Predestination and Analogy of Faith, Dr. Jacobs comes out openly and fully for the Lutheran and the Ohio view. The whole work is intended chiefly for the average pastor and the more intelligent lay readers, and is quite free from technical terms and learned paraphernalia. Unfortunately the work is given in the form of questions and answers, which we cannot otherwise but consider a serious mistake, as it prevents the fuller and freer succinct discussion of the various dogmas. Full quotations from the Scriptures, from the confessions and from Luther add to the merits of the work. It is eminently a work for students and for study, and we hope that many of our pastors will secure it and do some hard thinking in mastering its solid contents.

Pastor G. H. Trebel, of Hamilton, Ohio has published a rich collection of sermon skeletons for casual cases in his *Predigtentwuerfe fuer Kasuelle Zwecke*" (Published for the author by our Book Concern). It is a solid volume of 635 pages, and offers the pastor an almost overwhelming mass of matter for suggestive study. It furnishes texts and skeletons (many without a special text) for sermons, on funeral occasions, for confession and sacramental services, for con-

firmation, harvest time, mission, reformation festival, on the school problem, and in such special cases as church dedication, Synodical meetings, ordination, installation and others. In fact, it is difficult to imagine a special sermon demanded of a pastor for which he will not find help in this volume. The skeletons are systematic and logical and generally handle the text well. Many of them are so rich in contents that they furnish ample material for several sermons. Our pastors will not regret securing this helpful work. The price is $3.00, with the usual discount of twenty per cent., making it $2.40.

The *Zentralblatt fuer die gesamte Unterrichtsverwaltung in Preussen,* each year publishes an official report of the higher educational institutions in that kingdom. Recently again such a report made its appearence for the year 1905, according to which there are 665 institutions of this character in Prussia. Notwithstanding the decided tendency displayed in recent years for scientific studies, the humanistic or classical gymnasia and progymnasia still outnumber the scientific realgymnasia and their feeders. There are still 356 classical gymnasia, and of these 303 have the full nine years' course, while the scientific schools of all kinds only number 309, and of these only 117 are "full' institutions, i. e., have a nine years' course leading up to the universities, or only a little more than one-third as many as there are classical schools. Those institutions which are not "Vollanstalten," have only the first six classes of the "full" schools. A comparison with the condition of affairs in 1897 is interesting. During the past eight years 67 scientific *real* schools, 25 classical gymnasia, 13 *Oberreal* schools, and 2 progymnasia were established, but during the same period 46 semi-classical prorealgymnasia and 6 realgymnasia were changed into schools of another character. The most remarkable feature in the distribution of these schools is the fact that the Rhine province numer-

ically surpasses all the other provinces, even Brandenburg with the capital Berlin, as the former alone reports 116 institutions of this grade. The prorealgymnasia seem to be dying out, having retrogaded since 1897 from 67 to 21, and of the latter 8 are yet to be changed into schools of a different character. These are all various kinds of secondary schools.

Since the destruction of the library at Turin, in which so many valuable manuscripts were consumed, a number of plans have been proposed to guard against the repetition of such a calamity elsewhere. The reproduction of old manuscripts by photographic process finds the most advocates, but this is expensive and neither governments nor learned socities have offered the funds for this purpose. Only France has done something in this direction. According to the *Gaulois,* Professor Gauley, of the University of California, at the recent congress of librarians in Louvain, announced that a bureau had been organized in America in which clichés of valuable manuscripts are to be collected. Reproductions of these are to be placed at the disposal of savants at a moderate cost.

THE SALZBURG VACATION COURSES.

During several seasons a remarkable series of University extension work has been carried on in the Tyrol city of Salzburg with an attendance of nearly one thousand, and that very cosmopolitan in character. The establishment of these "Vacation Lectures" is largely owing to the initiative of the deceased octogenarian historian of Berlin, Professor Mommsen, who has all along been the defender of "academic liberty of research" in the Universities of the Fatherland. It is to a great extent a protest against the efforts of the government to establish "Caholic" chairs for certain branches, such as history, literature, and philosophy, which came to a head in the appointment of a young Catholic savant in Strassburg to teach modern history, although the

same task had already been assigned to a competent Protestant professor. Salzburg was selected as the place for these courses, because the Catholics of Austria and Southwestern Germany and Switzerland have for years been collecting funds to establish a distinctively "free" university in this historic town, independent entirely of state control and entirely under the management of the church. Going "into the enemy's country" with modern men and discussing modern problems according to the results of modern research was intended to be an object lesson to those who believe in a distinctively ecclesiastical science. About a score of German University men consented to give up their fall vacation to this work and the leading subjects of general interest are all down on the programme. The Catholics of Central Europe have already made one experiment of this kind with a "free" University in Freiburg, in Switzerland. However this school, which is entirely under the control of the Dominicans, after some nasty wrangling, managed to get rid of its independent thinkers in the teaching corps, and the kind of work done there is so low that a number of German Universities recently published a declaration to the effect that they would not recognize any work or examinations or degrees from the Freiburg institution. It is a significant fact that the Salzburg teaching faculty includes prominent Catholics as well as Protestants. The whole is a movement directed against coercion in the independent researches of scholarship.

Columbus Theological Magazine.

THIS Magazine is designed to supply the want of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim is the exposition and defense of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers, 35 cents.

All remittances should be addressed to LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, Columbus, Ohio. All communications pertaining to the Editorial Department and all exchanges to PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., Columbus, Ohio.

"The Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20, 28.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

IN ITS FOUNDATION, ESSENCE, APPEARANCE AND WORK.

By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.

Prompted by the purest motive, the desire to serve his Master by being helpful to his fellow-laborers, fully conscious that the unscriptural views on the subject endanger the soul and should be exposed, and confident "that the King will accompany it with His blessing," the author wrote and published this work.

"This work is notable for its comprehensive and yet simple analysis of its subject, and for its earnest devotion to the practical topics and problems that spring out of the Church life at every point." — *Lutheran Church Review.*

"The work is carefully prepared and well written. — *Lutheran Observer.*

The book contains 364 pages and sells for $1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

THE LUTHERAN COMMENTARY

By Scholars of the Lutheran Church in the United States under the editorial charge of Dr. H. E. Jacobs. This is a very valuable work and especially adapted to the wants of Pastors and Sunday-school Teachers. The 12 volumes bound in full cloth have been reduced in price from $2.00 to $1.50 per volume. We would call special attention to volume VI on the Acts of the Apostles by Dr. F. W. Stellhorn. Having too large a number on hand we will sell this volume until our stock is exhausted, at $1.25 per volume. Address :: :: :: :: :: ::

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 E. MAIN ST., COLUMBUS, O.

MODEL SERMONS. SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

By DR. M. LOY, Dean in Capital University.

These sermons are first scriptural then logical; noted for their simplicity in style and depth of thought, in full harmony with the confessions of the Lutheran Church. Preachers need these sermons as models, teachers will want them to use in the public service in the absence of the pastor, parents will find them to be just what they need in the home service on Sunday, and any Christian, young or old, will find in them the Manna which came down from heaven by which his soul is nourished unto eternal life.

Price, plain cloth, $2.50; half leather, $3.00; half morocco, $4.00; Imitation morocco, two volumes, $4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

BEFORE THE ALTAR

OR A SERIES OF ANNOTATED PROPOSITIONS ON LITURGICS, TO WHICH IS ADDED A SELECTION OF STANDARD FORMS.

By Dr. C. H. L. Schuette.

The author in his introduction remarks: "The writer will consider himself amply repaid for his labor, if this little book shall add to the number of those among God's people who worship 'with understanding:' and if ministers will take up the subject as it is here outlined and discuss it before their people, say in a course of lectures, there can be no doubt as to the result."

Price, bound in cloth, 75 cents; flexible, $1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

CHRISTIAN PRAYER

By M. LOY, D. D.

This book is in fact an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Pastors are inquiring for sermons on the catechism. There is nothing better in the English language on this, the third part of the catechism. Eight articles treat *The Model Prayer* in a general way, four explain and emphasize the words "Our Father." "Hallowed be Thy Name" is explained in three articles; "Thy Kingdom Come" in four. "Thy Will be Done" in seven articles, and "Give us this day our Daily Bread" in five." "Forgive us our Debts" is treated in five articles, and each of the remaining parts of the prayer is treated in four articles. Besides all this there are fifteen articles on "The Practice of Prayer," concluding with an article on the question: "Have You Family Worship?"

People who never pray should read this book that they may be brought to a sense of their duty and privilege. Those who have not been neglecting this Christian privilege will be encouraged to continue on the right way.

Price, 75 Cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

THE MEANS OF GRACE

BY REV. G. T. COOPERRIDER, A. M.

It furnishes a clear and adequate explanation of the Word and Sacraments, God's own appointed means for conveying to us His grace unto our salvation, rather in the light of a practical, broad interpreter than as a treatise of technicalities.

Handsomely Bound in full cloth, XIV and 157 pages. Per copy, 75 cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.